

HIPPOLYTUS

On The Apostolic  
Tradition

*an English Version with Introduction and Commentary by*

ALISTAIR STEWART-SYKES

ST VLADIMIR'S SEMINARY PRESS  
CRESTWOOD, NEW YORK 10707

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Hippolytus, Antipope, ca. 170–235 or 6.

[Traditio apostolica. English]

On the apostolic tradition / Hippolytus ; an English version with introduction and commentary by Alistair Stewart-Sykes.

p. cm. — (St. Vladimir's Seminary Press "popular patristics" series)

"Apostolic tradition was written in Greek, but only a few fragments are still extant in that language. Apostolic tradition is, however, extant in a number of translations and versions. The translation in this book is therefore a translation of translations"—Introd.

Includes bibliographical references (p. ) and indexes.

ISBN 0-88141-233-3

1. Christian life—Early works to 1800. 2. Church history—Primitive and early church, ca. 30–600—Sources. 3. Church orders, Ancient. I. Title: Apostolic tradition. II. Stewart-Sykes, Alistair. III. Title. IV. Series.

BR65.H84 T7313 2001

270.1—dc21

2001048380

COPYRIGHT ALISTAIR STEWART-SYKES © 2001



ST VLADIMIR'S SEMINARY PRESS

575 Scarsdale Rd., Crestwood, NY 10707

1-800-204-2665

[www.svspress.com](http://www.svspress.com)

ISBN 0-88141-233-3

ISBN 978-0-88141-233-8

ISSN 1555-5755

All Rights Reserved

First printed in 2001

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

# Contents

Preface	9
Introduction	
I <i>Apostolic Tradition</i>	11
II The establishment of a monepiscopate at Rome	12
III The discovery and identification of <i>Apostolic Tradition</i>	16
IV The title of <i>Apostolic Tradition</i>	20
V The "authorship" of <i>Apostolic Tradition</i>	22
VI The conclusions to <i>Apostolic Tradition</i>	32
VII The contents and arrangement of <i>Apostolic Tradition</i>	36
VIII The scholastic church of the Hippolytean community and its church order	38
IX The text of <i>Apostolic Tradition</i>	45
X A summary of conclusions	49
English version of <i>Apostolic Tradition</i> and commentary	53
Appendix: The Hippolytean <i>Homily on the Psalms</i>	175
Notes	183
Bibliography	207
Indices	
I Ancient texts	215
II Modern authors	218
III Subjects	220





*To John  
with love*



## Preface

To do justice to this text, the translator and commentator should be an expert not in liturgiology alone, but should have expertise in textual criticism and in the social and legal history of third century Rome, together with facility in six ancient languages. The intense specialization of the modern academy prevents the raising up of the needed polymath, and so a generalist and country parson has foolishly stepped into a breach, the existence of which he had not recognized when he agreed to undertake a simple translation. However, the need to justify the translation gave rise to the procedure of commenting on the text, and as it rapidly became clear that the solutions to the quandaries raised by the versions were not to be found in the sciences of textual criticism or philology alone, a separate commentary became necessary, which in time took on a life of its own. I am unsure of my qualifications in having undertaken such a task, having never claimed to be an orientalist or a classicist, but my conviction that the analysis of the Hippolytean school offered by Brent is the key to unlocking the mysteries of this text has illuminated my way at every turn.

I have sought to make the commentary accessible to those without the command of ancient languages, having in mind the needs of students and working clergy, and yet useful to the scholarly community. The translation may be read without reference to the commentary, and the comments on the text and the translation, and those on the content, may be read independently of one another. Although the procedure has proved at times to be clumsy and repetitive, it prevents the necessity of a multiplicity of brackets and fonts and the provision of an impenetrable apparatus. By no means is

every textual variant noted, and many obvious interpolations are simply ignored; for the full details of variants among the versions the reader is referred to the works of Dix and Botte, and to the apparatus of the published versions themselves. The aim of this work is to present in an accessible yet responsible manner an English version of what, in the author's opinion, was the text which emerged from the Hippolytean school in the first half of the third century together with the tools to make that text comprehensible.

Every author hopes for a good librarian and a good editor. In producing this version and commentary I have been assisted by the best of both, namely Ms Laura Moore, of St Mark's library in New York and Dr John Behr the editor of this series. Both have been invaluable at every stage of the development of the work. Thanks are also due to the Revd Gloria Bowden, of the Diocese of Atlanta, who assisted me in the early stages of the project and kept me sane and confident enough to begin it, to Professor Deirdre Good of New York, who generously shared her expertise in Coptic, to Professor Judith Newman, also of New York, without whom the appendix might never have been written, and to Professor Arthur Pomeroy of Wellington, New Zealand, who provided the last piece of the patronage jigsaw in response to an emailed request.

The greatest debt, however, is to the dedicatee, who has been a constant source of joy.

The Vicarage, Sturminster Marshall  
On the feast of St Polycarp 2001

# Introduction

## I APOSTOLIC TRADITION

*Apostolic Tradition* is an example of the genre known as "Church-order literature." It contains instructions and regulations for the life of the church dealing with ordinations, the offering of the eucharist and other community meals, the catechumenate and baptism, and the offering of prayer and individual study. No church-order deals with precisely the same material, some being more concerned with the conduct of individual Christians as a result of the expansion of catechetical material, but this is the typical ground covered by the genre. Conventionally, *Apostolic Tradition* has been attributed to a third century figure called Hippolytus of Rome. However, the traditional attribution is now subject to widespread doubt, and the evidence supplied by *Apostolic Tradition* for the liturgy and practice of the Roman church is therefore viewed with suspicion.<sup>1</sup> The commentary below attempts to preserve the traditional view, though in a somewhat different form from that in which it has been held in the past. It continues to hold that *Apostolic Tradition* is Roman, and broadly that it is third century in date but, rather than seeing it as the work of one person, Hippolytus, it suggests that Hippolytus is only the last in a series of figures who "wrote" *Apostolic Tradition*, which is the product of a community produced over a number of years. Whereas this situation is perhaps confusing, it is that which, we hope to show, makes best sense of all the evidence and allows us to use *Apostolic Tradition* to understand the liturgy of the Roman church in the third century, and indeed, since traditional material was used in its construction, for a period before that date. This text

has, since the time of its identification with the work of Hippolytus, been recognized as one of the earliest liturgical manuals in existence. The commentary will show that, in part at least, it is even earlier than has hitherto been suspected, though in its current form it dates from the third century at a time around 235.<sup>2</sup> However, before this argument can be presented, a step back needs to be taken. The evidence for the dating and redactional history proposed here for *Apostolic Tradition* derives from an understanding of the manner in which the church in Rome developed from its beginnings until 235, the date at which we have suggested that *Apostolic Tradition* was completed. We must therefore turn to that subject before going on to discuss Hippolytus and the church order associated with his name.

## II THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A MONOEPISCOPATE AT ROME

The reconstruction of the growth of a monepiscopate at Rome has recently been undertaken by Brent and Lampe;<sup>3</sup> both chart a path within Roman Christianity which originates with a series of diverse Christian communities and ends with the unification of the Roman church under a single bishop, although they differ with regard to the date which is to be assigned to the final establishment of a monepiscopate. The reconstruction of Brent is of particular interest as he correlates his reconstruction to the ordination rites to be found in *Apostolic Tradition*, which is for him a "crown witness" in reconstructing the social setting and the history of the Hippolytean community.<sup>4</sup> The understanding of *Apostolic Tradition* presented in this translation and commentary is dependent upon following Brent's reconstruction, and therefore his arguments must be followed in detail before anything further is said about *Apostolic Tradition* or about its author.

That the origin of Christianity at Rome lay in a series of entirely independent communities is clear from the various greetings to dif-

ferent households to be found in Paul's letter to the Roman churches.<sup>5</sup> A similar picture of diversity is to be found in the frequent references which both Hermas and Clement make to the leaders of the church, and the constant appeals which Hermas makes that there should be unity among these leaders.<sup>6</sup> The use of the plural, and the diversity of terms employed by both writers to refer to the leaders of the churches, indicate not only a variety of churches but a variety of understandings of the nature of office. Continued diversity is shown in the references made by Justin to the variety of different Christian communities to be found throughout the city, and in the manner in which Marcion is arraigned before presbyters and teachers, but no bishop.<sup>7</sup> Roman Christianity thus consisted of a number of self-governing churches with leaders described with various titles. Because the churches were self-governing individual communities, there was no bishop with responsibility for a number of churches, but each church might have its own leader, perhaps known as a bishop, perhaps as a presbyter.<sup>8</sup>

However, although Christianity in Rome consisted of a number of independent communities, it is nonetheless clear that alongside the self-government of individual churches there were, from a very early period, gatherings of the leaders, to some among whom particular functions might be delegated, such as Clement who is to communicate with churches outside the city of Rome.<sup>9</sup> It is from these offices that the office of bishop ultimately grew up in the Roman community, whether because the essential role of poor-relief led to the centralization of this function or due to the identification of the letter-writing functionaries with the whole Roman church.<sup>10</sup> For Lampe the decisive figure in the growth of the mon-episcopate is that of Victor, a Roman bishop in the last decade of the second century.<sup>11</sup> Lampe's suggestion is based on the role Victor played in the "paschal controversy" at the end of the second century, recorded by Eusebius. Among the diverse congregations at Rome there was diversity in the manner in which the paschal feast was kept. Christians of Asian descent did not keep an Easter on Sunday

but a festival on the fourteenth day of the Jewish month of Nisan, the Jewish Passover, regardless of the day of the week. This was preceded by a fast, and so it was quite possible for Asian Christians in Rome to be fasting on a Sunday. Victor apparently sought to terminate this practice and, when he did not succeed, he "sought to cut off straightaway the churches of all of the community of Asia from the common union."<sup>12</sup> It is certainly true that Victor attempted to act like a monarchical bishop in seeking unity over the paschal observance and in exchanging correspondence with Polycrates, the bishop of Ephesus, and Irenaeus (among others) in pursuit of this goal, but for all this, as Brent points out, the attempt was not successful.<sup>13</sup> Rather, Brent suggests, the monepiscopate at Rome cannot be said to be established until the time of Pontianus who, according to the Liberian catalogue, was martyred alongside Hippolytus, a presbyter, in 235. Brent points out that Pontianus is the first bishop in the Liberian catalogue whose dates are accurately given rather than simply being dated by consular years, which for him is decisive evidence in the settlement of a monepiscopate at Rome,<sup>14</sup> and the common exile and martyrdom of these two figures, as well as the record of Hippolytus as a presbyter alongside the bishop Pontianus, is to be taken as evidence of reconciliation between the Hippolytean community and the wider Roman church under its monarchical bishop.

Thus, rather than seeing Victor as the point at which movement towards the monepiscopate concluded, we may be more accurate in seeing this episcopate as the time when the movement took the decisive turn which would lead to the final establishment of a monepiscopate at around the time of Pontianus. Although Victor was apparently unsuccessful in enforcing his practice on the Asian communities in Rome, the fact that he even attempted to do this is indicative that there had already been some kind of concentration of authority in the person of the leading Roman presbyter, which would lead within 40 years to the final establishment of Roman monepiscopacy and to a solution to the paschal dispute. To see the



manner in which Rome cautiously moves towards a monepiscopate, rather than to credit Victor, or indeed Pontianus, with its sudden establishment, is sensitive to the evidence. In opposition to this view, Simonetti suggests that Dionysius of Corinth had seen Soter as bishop.<sup>15</sup> However, all this can prove is that Soter as a bishop (among other bishops, as head of a household community) was being particularly commended, and that this commendation of the leading presbyter by bishops from elsewhere would naturally lead to the holder of this position coming to prominence as *monepiscopus*, which is precisely the case argued by Brent.

This is relevant to the discussion of *Apostolic Tradition* because a work called the *Elenchus*, or "Refutation of all heresies," which is attributed to Hippolytus, is much concerned with a dispute which took place between this author and Callistus, a Roman bishop of around 217–222. If Brent's reconstruction is correct, then the dispute between the author of the *Refutation* and Callistus is to be understood as a dispute between two principal presbyters in Roman congregations, and in no way a formal schism, which is the way in which it has been understood in the past. This has obvious consequences for any historian attempting to trace a life of Hippolytus. Thus *Apostolic Tradition* was dated by Dix with reference to this schism; indeed, much of Dix's introduction is concerned to trace the schism between Hippolytus and the Roman church, to which we must reply that not only is the dating dependent on a schism which did not occur, but that such a schism could not have taken place because there was no *monepiscopus* at this time from which "Hippolytus" might secede.<sup>16</sup> As Powell points out, there is nothing in the *Refutation* which points to a formal schism and, during the Novatian schism, which occurred in the third century, there is no reference to any precedent.<sup>17</sup>

What we can say positively is that the Hippolytean community at the time of Callistus was particularly opposed to the growth of monepiscopacy, and that this opposition is given voice in the *Refutation*. However, we may gather from the manner in which the joint

exile and martyrdom of Pontianus the bishop and Hippolytus the presbyter is recorded that the breach had been healed by this time and the Hippolytean community had been reconciled to the Roman bishop. According to this reconstruction, however, the author of the *Refutation* cannot be the same Hippolytus who was exiled alongside Pontianus. The former considered himself a bishop among others, the latter was a presbyter in communion with a single bishop in the city. Which, if either, of these figures is the author of *Apostolic Tradition*?

### III THE DISCOVERY AND IDENTIFICATION OF *APOSTOLIC TRADITION*

*Apostolic Tradition* was published in various versions in the course of the nineteenth century beginning with a Bohairic version, actually the most recent translation, in 1848. It is found as one component of a number of collections of church order literature, and became known as the "Egyptian Church Order." It should be noted that it was transmitted in these collections anonymously and without a title. Beside *Apostolic Tradition* these collections contained, among other church orders, the *Canons of Hippolytus*, and the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. These three works were clearly related, though the precise relationship was less clear. The identification of the "Egyptian Church Order" with the work of the third century figure, Hippolytus, called *Apostolic Tradition* was first suggested by von der Goltz in 1906,<sup>18</sup> and won widespread scholarly acceptance through the independently completed works of Schwartz and Connolly, published in 1910 and 1916 respectively.<sup>19</sup> The essence of their argument was that the "Egyptian Church Order" was the earliest of the related works in the canonical collections, and that upon which some of the others depended. On the basis of that conclusion, the next step was to identify this work with that of Hippolytus on the basis of the appearance of Hippolytus'

name in some of the versions which were dependent upon this church order. The reasoning was that if Hippolytus' name was attached to the later members of the series, it must therefore have belonged to the first. The next step involved guessing that its original title was *Apostolic Tradition*, and once this guess had been made it was possible to identify the work with that title as the work of that name in a catalogue of works inscribed on a statue, discovered during the Renaissance, which was believed to be that of Hippolytus. A catalogue of works was inscribed on the base of the statue which had similarities to the lists of Hippolytus' works given by Jerome and Eusebius. The statue was subsequently identified as a statue of Hippolytus on the basis of these works and on the basis of a table for the calculation of Pascha which was also on the base of the statue.<sup>20</sup> In subsequent discussion a number of other arguments were produced from the language and contents of *Apostolic Tradition*, of which note will be taken in the commentary.

Although there have always been dissenting voices, the attribution to Hippolytus became the consensus. Opposition was raised on the grounds that the liturgy represented by the document was not Roman. Hanssens devotes immense effort to the attempt to show that the liturgy of *Apostolic Tradition* was Alexandrian,<sup>21</sup> but since so much of the evidence for Alexandrian liturgy is late, and may even have been influenced by *Apostolic Tradition*, he has found few followers. A more focused attempt to deny the Roman origin of the liturgy of *Apostolic Tradition* is that of Salles.<sup>22</sup> We will follow his arguments briefly as, in refuting them, we are able to see how likely it is that the liturgy described in *Apostolic Tradition* is indeed Roman.

Salles concentrates on the baptismal liturgies found in chapters 15–21 of *Apostolic Tradition*. He begins by contrasting the later Roman enrollment of postulants, which was a solemn liturgical occasion, marked by a renunciation and the giving of salt, with that of *Apostolic Tradition*, which is relatively simple. What Salles fails to notice, however, is that according to *Apostolic Tradition* this is the business of a private teacher, whereas only in a later period, with the

centralization of Roman Christianity, does this become the business of the bishop, with the resultant possibility that ritual may develop. Moreover, when it comes to actual enrollment for baptism, we note in the commentary below that the rite described by *Apostolic Tradition* is of the sort that might have developed into the Roman first scrutiny, at which election for baptism took place.<sup>23</sup> Salles then goes on to comment that *Apostolic Tradition* knows nothing of the other scrutinies, whereas we shall note in the commentary that the foundation of the main scrutinies of the later Roman practice are actually in place, for there are two exorcisms prior to baptism in *Apostolic Tradition*, not one, as Salles asserts, and each corresponds in time and function to a scrutiny in the later Roman practice. Salles is further confused on the order of scrutinies, when he states that the unction with the oil of exorcism occurs in *Apostolic Tradition* before the baptism, whereas it occurs in the classical Roman rites on the morning of Holy Saturday. However, as will be shown in the commentary below, the use of oil in the ceremonies of Holy Saturday is a late development in the rite, of which *Apostolic Tradition* preserves a primitive version. In turning to the baptismal service itself Salles further asserts that the post-baptismal handlaying took place in the baptistery in the classical Roman rites, as opposed to the entry into the church in *Apostolic Tradition*. This aspect of the rite in *Apostolic Tradition* is rather contentious, as Botte uses the second unction which takes place here, and is only found in Roman rites, as evidence for the Roman origin of the liturgy.<sup>24</sup> However, it will be suggested in the commentary below that this is a practice unique to the Hippolytean community, and so proves nothing either way. Finally Salles suggests that there is no proof that milk and honey was ever given at Rome, whereas actually there is good evidence of this practice in the second century.<sup>25</sup> Quite apart from being erroneous at several points, Salles further fails to observe that there are details in the practice of baptism in *Apostolic Tradition* which make sense of otherwise obscure points of later Roman practice, such as the direction given by the bishop in prayer and bending the knee at 20.7,

which clarifies the corresponding point in the Gelasian sacramentary, which concludes with the deacon's exhortation to pray and to bend the knee, an instruction which is followed by no prayer. The strange directions of the Gelasian sacramentary can be understood if we see that this is a relic of actual instruction, of which *Apostolic Tradition* informs us. Similarly the giving of a cup of water at the post-baptismal eucharist described by *Apostolic Tradition* illuminates a somewhat mysterious blessing of water, milk and honey preserved in one of the masses for the newly baptized in the Leonine sacramentary.<sup>26</sup> Thus although one answer to Salles is that the Roman church changed beyond recognition in the time between *Apostolic Tradition* and the sacramentaries,<sup>27</sup> we may give a more robust answer that, in spite of those changes, the broad lines of the later rites may be found in this section of the work which, we intend to argue in the commentary, goes back to the second century.

Going beyond the baptismal rites we may briefly note other arguments for a Roman origin to the liturgies described in *Apostolic Tradition*. We may for instance note that chapter 22 of *Apostolic Tradition* is absolutely incomprehensible unless read in the light of later Roman liturgical practice, and may also observe that what is said of burial methods in chapter 40 is clearly Roman.<sup>28</sup> We have already noted the great diversity among the Roman congregations, and we should therefore beware of looking for any normative liturgy for the churches of the period against which to compare the rites of *Apostolic Tradition*, just as we should beware of turning *Apostolic Tradition* into such a normative liturgy. In this light, the surprising thing is just how typically Roman its liturgy actually is!

The liturgy of *Apostolic Tradition*, as well as other internal indications, show that it is Roman and third century in origin. But whereas this makes an attribution to Hippolytus possible, it does not necessitate it. The first step in Connolly's argument is good, but it does not yet prove the authorship which Connolly established.

## IV THE TITLE OF APOSTOLIC TRADITION

*Apostolic Tradition* is a Roman document of third century date. However, the attribution to Hippolytus depended in part on the identification of this work with a work called "Apostolic Tradition" on the statue, supposedly of Hippolytus. Quite apart from the fact that the statue is certainly not of Hippolytus, the attribution made on this basis is particularly controversial as there is no evidence that the work we possess ever had the title of "Apostolic Tradition." This step has already been described as a guess. Equally dubious moreover is the identification of Hippolytus as its author on the basis of the appearance of this name in the later versions of *Apostolic Tradition*. As Brent points out, the name had, even by the fifth century, become a cipher for apostolic orthodoxy, and a late attribution to this figure is therefore no more trustworthy than contemporary attributions to Clement.<sup>29</sup> Thus although *Apostolic Tradition* was readily shown to be the earliest in the series of church orders, and is probably Roman, there was no basis to connect it with Hippolytus except a series of guesses leading back to a title on a statue whose purpose was actually unclear! Put like this, the argument for attribution is far from strong and would not convince at all did we not possess *Apostolic Tradition*. However, *Apostolic Tradition* patently is a work deriving from third century Rome, and there are many literary parallels between it and the works of the Hippolytean corpus. These internal arguments, which will be noted in the commentary, are those which are decisive for the attribution of the work.

Because the arguments over the title and the attribution to Hippolytus in the church-order collections are not those which are decisive or central to the identification of *Apostolic Tradition*, the argument will not be followed in detail here.<sup>30</sup> There is, moreover, little that can be added to the discussion, except an observation that titles in the ancient world were flexible. They did not serve as unique identifiers of works as titles do today, but as rough indications of the contents of a work.<sup>31</sup> It is thus equally possible for the same work to

be known as "Regulations of the apostles given through Hippolytus," the title it receives in the Ochrid fragment,<sup>32</sup> and "Apostolic Tradition." *Apostolic Tradition* is not, however, precisely the title which appears on the statue. The statue actually lists "On charismata" and, in the following line, "Apostolic Tradition." These are not alternative titles, as there is no intervening "or,"<sup>33</sup> but rather this is the title of the entire work, which may be rendered into English as: "Apostolic tradition concerning spiritual gifts."<sup>34</sup> Support for this understanding is to be found in the work itself, which begins with a brief reference to a discussion of spiritual gifts. This is not, however, the opening of a separate book, as there is no precise reference to such a work, but a reference to an immediately prior discussion of the subject.<sup>35</sup> Further arguments may be marshalled in support of seeing this as the title by which the work was known in the Hippolytean community. Firstly we should note that "apostolic tradition" is a description of a genre rather than a title,<sup>36</sup> and secondly that the adaptation of such a genre to the treatment of charismata is in accordance with the theological agenda of its author, which will be noted below. Also below we shall argue that the author adapted a document which was already in existence. This was the original "apostolic tradition," which was brought to bear on the subject of spiritual gifts. This is the understanding which is exhibited by the Epitome of *Apostolic Constitutions* 8 when it refers to "Regulations of the holy apostles concerning ordination through Hippolytus," as it recognizes first that Hippolytus is not claiming to be the author as such, and secondly that there is a definite interest in ordination, which *Apostolic Tradition* takes to be of more importance in the constitution of the church than any charisma. The addition of an extended section on ordination to a pre-existent work, so that the work overall begins with the ordination of a bishop, is thus the interpretative clue to the relevance of the church order to charisma, for church-order, founded upon the succession of bishops as described in the poem of the *Refutation*, is what anchors the rule of faith.<sup>37</sup>

Thus although "Apostolic Tradition" will be used as the title

throughout this work, it should be borne in mind that the title is a shorthand for that by which it was known in its original community, namely "Apostolic Tradition concerning spiritual gifts."

## V THE "AUTHORSHIP" OF *APOSTOLIC TRADITION*

Even though we have shown that *Apostolic Tradition* is a work deriving from third century Rome, and that an attribution to Hippolytus on these grounds is therefore reasonable, further problems remain. In particular, the works traditionally attributed to Hippolytus are not all of the same hand. For instance there are significant differences between the christologies expressed in the *Refutation*, to which reference has already been given, and another work attributed to Hippolytus, *Against the Heresy of one Noetus*.<sup>38</sup> Beyond this, it has recently been pointed out that *Apostolic Tradition* itself is not a seamless whole, but appears to be the product of much redactional activity.<sup>39</sup> We intend to deal with these two problems together, as they are actually related. We will begin by accepting that there are indeed two authors in the Hippolytean corpus. But rather than endangering the attribution of *Apostolic Tradition*, or demanding that we choose the Hippolytus to whom we wish to attribute the work, this observation makes an attribution of *Apostolic Tradition* to "Hippolytus" all the more likely, as such an attribution in turn explains the redactional activity which is apparent in the text. For although we may accept that the works attributed to Hippolytus are those of two separate authors, the second of whom was called Hippolytus,<sup>40</sup> we will argue that both authors worked within the same school in Rome, the second succeeding the first, and that *Apostolic Tradition* is the work of both authors. Only an attribution to the Hippolytean school, with its tensions and developments, we suggest, satisfactorily explains the document as it stands, with its own many tensions, indicative of development in church order during the period of its construction. The main argument will be found in the



commentary, and this introduction is therefore only a preliminary statement of the hypothesis, which will be proven in detail at numerous points within the work.

We have already observed that a significant step in the arguments which led to the attribution of *Apostolic Tradition* to Hippolytus was the appearance of a work of that name on a statue, thought to be of Hippolytus. The attribution of the works on the statue to Hippolytus became particularly controversial through the work of Nautin, who argued that the works were not Hippolytean at all, but the works of an earlier figure named Josephus, who was a rough contemporary of Callistus and who was the author of the *Refutation* and other associated works.<sup>41</sup> However, the situation is not tidy, and although *Apostolic Tradition* appears on the plinth to the statue, Nautin suggests that this refers to a work of Josephus, and that which is extant is a separate work, of Hippolytus, who was an author from the middle years of the third century and who was also responsible for *Against Noetus* and a number of exegetical works.<sup>42</sup> That Nautin should be led to such special pleading is an indication that, although his fundamental arguments concerning the differences between the blocks of work in the Hippolytean corpus are sound, the solution forced upon him by attributing all the works on the statue to a single author leads to intractable problems.

A variation on Nautin's theory is that of Simonetti and Loi who, like Nautin, are convinced that the Hippolytean corpus included the work of two writers but, rather than have recourse to an otherwise unknown Josephus, suggest that the two authors may be identified as a Roman presbyter and a bishop from the east. Confusion between the two came about since both bore the name of Hippolytus.<sup>43</sup> It is worth noting that for Loi the *Apostolic Tradition* is to be placed as the work of the author of the *Refutation*, the Roman presbyter.<sup>44</sup> However it is hard to see the author of the *Refutation* as a presbyter set under a single bishop, which is the situation of presbyters presupposed by parts of *Apostolic Tradition*. These authors departed from the commonly agreed point that the works on the

statue were all those of the same author, and that this author could not be the author of the whole corpus assigned to Hippolytus on the grounds of contradictions between the *Refutation* and *Against Noetus* in particular.

But although the tensions between parts of the Hippolytean corpus, and in particular between the christologies of the *Refutation* and *Against Noetus*, are so great that it is virtually impossible to maintain an identity of authorship, the solution of Nautin based on the attribution of all the works to be found on the plinth of the statue to a single figure other than Hippolytus is equally problematic; works appear on the plinth of the statue which may be attributed to both blocks of material, and no satisfactory explanation has been proposed by which a confusion between two authors so different might arise in the course of the third century among those who were presumably acquainted with the individuals. Brent, however, has proposed a solution which cuts through this Gordian knot of problems. He suggests firstly that the statue, which is of a female figure, is not of Hippolytus at all, but a personification of wisdom, and the property of a school; as such a connection between the statue and the name of Hippolytus might be maintained.<sup>45</sup> The works on the plinth therefore need not be the works of a single author but the products of a school in which there is more than one author.<sup>46</sup> Thus *Apostolic Tradition* might derive from that school, but need not therefore definitively be by Hippolytus, or by any other author, but the product of a community. The community was in existence at the time of the controversy with Callistus detailed in *Refutation* 9, and was reconciled with the Roman episcopate by the time of Pontianus, at which point Hippolytus and Pontianus suffer a joint exile.<sup>47</sup> The date of *Apostolic Tradition* is thus open, but to be found at some time between these two dates. More significantly we should note that as the work of a community it may be the product of more than one author.

In line with Brent's suggestion that the works on the statue are the work not of any one author but of a school, we intend to demon-

strate in the commentary below that there are two authors in *Apostolic Tradition*. The first is the author of the *Refutation*, the second that of *Against Noetus*. At numerous points in the text the voice of one or the other author may be clearly heard once we identify the voices for which are listening. For convenience the first will be called <sup>R</sup>El, (the redactor who is also responsible for the *Elenchus*) and the second <sup>R</sup>CN (the redactor who is also responsible for the *Contra Noetum*). With regard to church order we may characterize the distinct outlooks of these two redactors as episcopal, in the case of <sup>R</sup>El, and presbyteral, in the case of <sup>R</sup>CN. <sup>R</sup>El is concerned to protect the role of the bishop against powerful presbyters in his community, who, we shall argue, are patrons of the Hippolytean community, as well as against the claims of *episkopē* made elsewhere in the Roman church, whereas <sup>R</sup>CN is a presbyter who recognizes a single bishop in Rome, and who sees himself as a presbyter in communion with other presbyters and with that *monepiscopus*. Thus rubrics for the ordination of a bishop in chapter two, which suggest that other bishops from the Roman church will be present, may thus be reconciled with chapter twenty-two, which discusses presbyters celebrating in their own churches and receiving gifts from the single bishop's altar, by attributing the first chapter to the hand of <sup>R</sup>El and the other to <sup>R</sup>CN. Similarly we may observe the disjunction which is to be found between the ordination prayers at chapters three and seven. In particular Brent observes the very different typologies employed of the bishop at chapter seven (in the prayer for the ordination of a presbyter) and chapter three (that of the episcopal ordination);<sup>48</sup> the latter has an Aaronic and hieratic typology, whereas the former employs the image of Moses who, as a teacher, appointed elders who shared in the same spirit. However, Brent goes on to show that the particular themes of the two prayers, the hieratic theme of the first and the interrelationship between presbyterium and bishop implied by the second are in keeping with the theological emphases of his two main authors.<sup>49</sup> Thus the preface to the *Refutation* states that the author is successor not only to the teaching of the apostles but also

to the gift of the high-priestly spirit. By contrast, the more presbyteral spirit breathed by *Against Noetus*<sup>50</sup> is in keeping with the vision of the presbyterate of *Apostolic Tradition* 7, according to which the presbyters share in the spirit with the bishop just as the elders appointed shared in the spirit of Moses.

Thus, although we may agree that *Apostolic Tradition* was indeed what Bradshaw calls "living literature"<sup>51</sup> and that for this reason it has inconsistencies and tensions which reflect the changing circumstances of the community which gathered and used the material it contained, this does not mean that there was at no time a text which represented a finished product, at least as far as the Roman community which produced it was concerned. Rather there were two finished products, one succeeding the other as <sup>R</sup>CN succeeded <sup>R</sup>El. A comparison with the work of biblical scholarship may be fruitful here. Isaiah, for instance, is the work of generations and demonstrates a series of responses to the changing circumstances of Israel from a time during the Assyrian crisis to a period after the exile. Part of the purpose of form and redaction criticism is to separate out the strands of tradition, to see how they have been put together to make the document that now stands extant. Although *Apostolic Tradition* represents the changing circumstances of a somewhat smaller community over a somewhat shorter period, the principle is the same. We might add that were the Hebrew text of Isaiah not extant we would of necessity rely upon the targums, the Septuagint and the Peshitta, themselves applications of the prophetic text, which would lead us to despair of ever reconstructing the original text, but would not therefore lead us to doubt that the Book of the Prophet existed, albeit as the result of a series of levels of redaction, and with a tenuous connection with its eponymous supposed author. *Apostolic Tradition* existed as a document at one time and, although we may be suspicious about any version, and may despair of ever reconstructing the Greek text with total confidence, we cannot doubt that such a Greek text once existed. The difference between *Apostolic Tradition* and scriptural texts however lies in that whereas Isaiah the prophet pro-

vided the first level of material which was subsequently redacted, the name of Hippolytus, which is representative of the school, is probably the last before *Apostolic Tradition* became the possession of the wider church and the name became a cipher.<sup>52</sup> Tensions stand within the text of Isaiah, and these tensions are the clue to our reconstruction of the history of the book. The same procedure of observing tensions may assist us in understanding the process which brought about the collocation of different theologies of ordination and diverse eucharistic practices into the single book called *Apostolic Tradition*.

If the comparison with Old Testament scholarship has any validity we may be permitted to recognize *Apostolic Tradition* as a document built up of various levels but which has undergone editing at various stages through attempts to render it a usable product in a community, and so to chart the manner in which the editing has been undertaken with the aim of understanding its nature when employed in the Roman school of Hippolytus at various periods. Thus, rather than seeking total consistency in the text as it stands or despairing of explaining the tensions altogether, the text may be seen as constructed of different layers, each of which reflects a different stage in the history of the Hippolytean community. If Brent's explanation of the relationship between the two authors, according to which the author of *Against Noetus* succeeded to the chair of the author of the *Refutation*, is accepted as a hypothesis, then an explanation for the tensions as resulting from redactional activity on *Apostolic Tradition* over a period would tend to support the hypothesis of two authors as successive leaders of the same school, since it succeeds in explaining how the two theologies may each be found in *Apostolic Tradition* side by side. However, if Simonetti's suggestion that the two authors are contemporaneous is the working hypothesis, it cannot explain why two theologies of episcopate, each reflecting the outlook of a different author, might appear in the same document.

The proof of this dual-redaction theory will be found in the commentary, but a brief illustration may be given here. In chapter eight, which concerns the duties of deacons, it is possible to see how

the second redactor has worked over the material deriving from the first, altering the perspective from one concentrating on the relationship between the bishop and the deacon, which excludes the presbyters, to one which concentrates on the distinction between the diaconate and the presbyterate set under the bishop.

<sup>R</sup>El: And when a deacon is installed let him be chosen in accordance with those things which were said above, in the same way the bishop alone laying hands. Just so we prescribe that at the ordination of a deacon the bishop alone lays hands, for the reason that he is not ordained to priesthood, but to serve the bishop, that he might do those things which are commanded by him.

<sup>R</sup>CN: For he is not a participant in the council of the clergy but looks after and indicates to the bishop what is necessary, not receiving the spirit of the presbytery which the presbyters share, but that which is entrusted him under the power of the bishop.

<sup>R</sup>El: For which reason the bishop alone shall ordain a deacon;

<sup>R</sup>CN: on a presbyter however the presbyters also lay their hands because of the common and like spirit of their order.

<sup>R</sup>El: For the presbyter has authority in this matter only, that he may receive; he does not, however, have the authority to give.

<sup>R</sup>CN: Therefore he does not appoint clergy; at the ordination of a presbyter he seals, as the bishop lays hands.

<sup>R</sup>El: Over a deacon, therefore, let him say thus:

However, in keeping with this theory of redactional activity, we may go on to suggest that the primary redactor, <sup>REI</sup>, did not start with a blank sheet but with an ancient text, or texts. This has been suggested already by Botte, who singles out the chapters on baptism as betraying literary marks of existence prior to "Hippolytus'" work,<sup>53</sup> and by Hennecke.<sup>54</sup> This material will be referred to throughout as P, where P stands for "paradosis," the Greek word for "tradition," which is the manner in which part of the ancient material at least refers to itself.

It is hard to prove the existence of a document which no longer exists due to its thorough redaction into another document, but two observations beyond that of the obvious literary seam at the end of the chapter on baptism may be counted as, if not ineluctable deductive proof, at least indications of probability.

First, if chapters 25–27, 32 and 36–38 are read consecutively, and intervening material is ignored, a clear pattern emerges by which a meal is first described and then regulated. On entirely independent grounds, most of the other chapters in this section can be ascribed without hesitation to one or other of the two main redactors. Thus a base document with its own logic and structure is laid bare, which has been incorporated into <sup>REI</sup>'s work, just as <sup>REI</sup>'s work was subsequently incorporated into that of <sup>RCN</sup>.

Second, there is no P material before the chapters on Baptism. Jungklaus contrasted *Apostolic Tradition* with the *Didache* in that it begins with ordination, rather than baptism,<sup>55</sup> and we may press that parallel further, since it appears that P, like the church-order provision of the *Didache*, begins with baptism. We have already suggested that P has a section regulating the ritual meals of the community, and this is found in *Apostolic Tradition* after the chapter on baptism, and we may note that the *Didache* likewise, having dealt with baptism, goes on to deal with meals in the community. Thus P would not be an entirely unique document if our construction is correct, but a document having the same outline as the *Didache* after its catechetical section.

We thus suggest that <sup>R</sup>El, in pursuit of his agenda, significantly edited P by adding material onto the front concerning the selection and ordination of bishops and deacons, apart from working through the other material. We have already described his outlook as hieratic and have noted his understanding of the episcopate as the guarantor of the truth of faith and the successor of the apostles, and will suggest below that this claim is made over against the proprietorial claims of the patron-elders. This hieratic view leads him to supplement P with the material concerning ordinations in such a way that the episcopate is brought to the fore of the church's self-understanding. The second figure in the school, <sup>R</sup>CN, then worked over the document, which by now was *Apostolic Tradition*, in order to make it usable in a congregation now united to the Roman church, and in order to enshrine some of his own emphases. Thus the eucharistic prayer provided for use at an episcopal ordination is interpolated, and an ordination prayer for presbyters is added. Presbyters, as they are in *Against Noetus*, are teachers and agents of tradition as was the bishop for <sup>R</sup>El.

The existence of P, once recognized on literary grounds, further clarifies some tensions and peculiarities in *Apostolic Tradition*. For instance, the lack of clarity which we will observe in the instructions concerning baptism—whether the minister of the rite is a bishop or a presbyter—can be explained if we see that the chapter is basically P, but that <sup>R</sup>El, with his agenda of bringing the bishop to the center of the life of the church, has worked over it and marked it with his own preoccupations.

Beyond the reworking of P, we may also observe instances where P is left intact, but given significant shifts in meaning due to re-employment of the material by <sup>R</sup>El. As an example, we may observe that chapters 25–29 at present seem to present a seamless discussion of a single meal, which led Dix to use it as the basis for his description of an agape in Rome at the time of Hippolytus.<sup>56</sup> On closer observation, however, it is possible to discern that the seamlessness is an illusion, and that the illusory unity is the work of <sup>R</sup>El, who has



added chapter 28 and has, as a result, altered the entire manner in which the prior chapters are read. Chapters 25–26, at least, are of considerable antiquity, and describe a eucharistic meal deeply rooted in Jewish practice, but the original eucharistic content has disappeared through the redeployment of the material in <sup>R</sup>El's editorial work. The redeployment of these chapters again exemplifies the phenomenon of "living literature" in that material from a considerably earlier period has been re-interpreted through supplementation as each generation re-utilized these writings and adapted them to their own situation. We will suggest in the commentary that chapters 36–38 have similarly undergone a shift of meaning as a result of <sup>R</sup>El's redeployment of their material for, whereas they once regulated the meal described in chapters 25–26, they now regulate private reception of the eucharist at home due to their separation from their original context by the interpolation of other material.

The indebtedness of this redactional theory to the work of Brent will be obvious. Brent himself does not, however, follow through his own insights with regard to *Apostolic Tradition*, in part because he is misled by those who see *Apostolic Tradition* as heavily interpolated. However, there is ample evidence within *Apostolic Tradition*, as will become apparent in the commentary, to justify his theory of two authors within a single school. In solving the problem of the Hippolytean corpus he has given a key to the interpretation of *Apostolic Tradition*, a key which unlocks not that document alone but which brings liturgical practice of even greater antiquity into the light. Beyond this, the clear literary and theological parallels to the work of his two authors within *Apostolic Tradition* may be taken as further proof of his hypothesis beyond that which he offers himself.

In conclusion, we suggest that there are two "authors" of *Apostolic Tradition*. The first worked over, and included, much traditional material. The second worked over the material left by the first! The result is that this document contains material of considerable antiquity, as well as material dating from the late second century and material deriving from the middle of the third. It is no longer possi-

ble to talk blithely of "Hippolytus" except as a shorthand, but we can speak confidently of a Hippolytean school with its two chief authors, and observe the manner in which *Apostolic Tradition* bears witness to the development of that school over forty or so years.

## VI THE CONCLUSIONS TO *APOSTOLIC TRADITION*

One of the peculiarities of *Apostolic Tradition* which has reduced commentators to bafflement is the fact that it has two conclusions, which indicates that it circulated in two different versions.<sup>57</sup> We may suggest that the theory of two redactors solves this literary riddle with ease.

In the Latin version, after the instructions concerning deacons' duties, the following chapters are to be found:

- Directions on praying upon awakening
- Directions on receiving communion at home
- Directions on signing oneself with the cross
- An apparent conclusion (which breaks off in mid-sentence)

Following a lacuna, it picks up in the midst of directions on daily prayer, which are followed by:

- Directions on signing oneself with the cross
- A conclusion

The conclusions and the directions on signing with the cross are doublets of one another, and the Sahidic version indicates that the directions on praying upon awakening are duplicated on the chapter on daily prayer, part of which is missing from the Latin version.

The Sahidic version has the following chapters:

- Directions on praying upon awakening

- Directions on receiving communion at home
- Directions on the duties of the clergy
- Directions on cemeteries
- Directions on daily prayer (duplicating in part the section on praying on awakening)
- Directions on signing oneself with the cross
- Conclusion

This appears to be a rationalization of the confusion created by the situation indicated by the Verona palimpsest.<sup>58</sup> It allows the duplication concerning prayer on awakening to stand, but deletes the first appearance of the chapter concerning signing oneself with the cross, and then (after including material which appears authentic but is absent from the Latin version because of the lacuna) follows the Latin version again.

This indicates that there were two separate versions circulating which had different conclusions, and that the Latin translator has translated each in turn. The first version concludes in line with the Verona palimpsest before the lacuna, whereas the other drops the instructions concerning communion at home but has the discussion of the duties of the clergy and the care of cemeteries immediately after the section on the duties of deacons, then picks up the instructions on prayer on awakening and expands them to discuss daily prayer. This leads on to the section on the signing with the cross, and so to the conclusion.

We may lay out the two conclusions thus:

Duties of deacons

Prayer on awakening

Receiving Communion at home

Signing oneself with the cross

Conclusion

Duties of deacons

Further on duties of deacons

Care for the cemetery

Daily prayer

Signing oneself with the cross

Conclusion

The question naturally arises why there are two separate conclusions since, as Easton points out, a single author is hardly likely to have produced two separate endings.<sup>59</sup> Both conclusions have their logic. The first forms a section directed to the devotions of individuals, once it has concluded with the discussion of the duties of deacons, whereas the second continues that discussion by turning to the further duties of deacons and other clergy to gather and to teach, and subsequently discusses the cemetery, which was under the care of a deacon. Then, in conformity with the shape of the earlier conclusion, it turns to the devotion of individuals, before concluding.

A single author is indeed unlikely to have produced two separate endings to the same work. Two authors however, especially when the second is editing and expanding the work of the first, are eminently capable of producing two separate endings to the same work.

Before following up this suggestion we should note that the majority explanation for the existence of the two versions, since the work of Wilmart mentioned above, is that two versions were indeed produced, even though commentators are at a loss to explain the reason why this should be. There are, however, three minority opinions.

First, Jungklaus suggests, on the grounds that the Latin of the second conclusion is generally better than that of the first, that the Latin manuscript presents us with the work of two translators, one of whom had an interpolated text.<sup>60</sup> The problem with this theory is that it involves seeing the material which is unique to one or the other ending as interpolated. This is highly unlikely as much of this material, like the discussion of the reception of Communion at chapters 36–38 and the discussion of the cemetery, is indisputably Roman and incomprehensible outside of a third-century context.

Second, Botte, on similar grounds, suggests that the second ending is a revision of the first.<sup>61</sup> Although this explains the duplications it does not explain the divergences, for the two conclusions, for all their similarity, are also markedly different.

Finally, Phillips attempts to explain the two conclusions on

mechanical grounds.<sup>62</sup> He suggests that an early archetype of *Apostolic Tradition* lost its ending, and that a later scribe combined the two resulting recensions to produce a combined ending, which came into the hands of the translator who produced the Latin version. Although this solution is not neat, it would be tenable were it not for the appearance of a conclusion immediately before the lacuna in the Latin version, a conclusion which is subsequently duplicated. Although it is possible to explain the other duplications due to scribal activity, this cannot be explained in this way, but could only come about if there was a complete recension of *Apostolic Tradition* in existence which concluded at that point.

We would thus be left with the conundrum of the production of two endings by one author. This is the conundrum which the dual redaction theory can solve. In the comment below it will be observed that the expanded section on daily prayer is the work of <sup>R</sup>CN, as are the discussions of the duties of the clergy and the care of cemeteries. We can thus readily assign the two conclusions to the two redactions of *Apostolic Tradition*. For although a single author is hardly likely to have produced two separate endings, two authors may well have done so. The two redactions do not appear in the manuscript tradition until this point, as only at this point does <sup>R</sup>CN actually omit material deriving from the earlier recension (namely that which concerned communion at home), thus clearly indicating that a different recension is in existence. The omission may have been accidental, but was enough to alert the translators, who might otherwise have assumed that the shorter version was incomplete, to the existence of two separate recensions, and thus, as the Latin translator did, to copy both conclusions. The original Latin version would thus have been as follows:

Directions on praying on awakening	) <sup>R</sup> El's conclusion
Directions on receiving Communion at home	)
Directions on signing oneself with the cross	)
Conclusion	)

Directions on the duty of the clergy*	} <sup>RCN's conclusion</sup>
Directions on cemeteries*	}
Directions on daily prayer	}
Directions on signing oneself with the cross	}
Conclusion	}
*Wholly or partly lacunose in Latin and therefore conjectural.	

## VII THE CONTENTS AND ARRANGEMENT OF APOSTOLIC TRADITION

Botte describes the order of topics in *Apostolic Tradition* thus:

During chapters 1–21 everything seems to appear in a logical order. The constitution of the church is described, beginning with the bishop, the priest and the deacon, who constitute the hierarchy, then going on to those who have particular roles in the church. Then the manner in which one enters the church is described, the catechumenate and the rites of initiation. However, after the chapter on baptism, it is very difficult to justify the order. We might see in chapters 22–30 a series of prescriptions concerning the meal of the community, but in this progression it is hard to find any logical order.<sup>63</sup>

It is actually possible to discern more order in the final chapters of *Apostolic Tradition* than Botte thinks possible, though we may start by agreeing with his assessment of the order of the first twenty-one chapters. Ordination stands at the head of the prescriptions for reasons hinted at in the preface, namely that the leaders of the churches have gone astray. We shall argue further below in this introduction, and in the commentary, that these leaders are the presbyters and

patrons of the Roman churches, and the solution which is proposed by <sup>R</sup>El is obedience to the episcopate, the high priesthood, which guards the tradition. For this reason episcopal ordination stands at the head of the document, thus supplementing P. The section has been expanded and interpolated by <sup>R</sup>CN, not least through the addition of a prayer for the ordination of presbyters, but its logic holds nonetheless. The instructions for baptism follow on fairly logically, though we may now observe that their place results from their place in P. Finally, Botte had thought that chapters 22–30 concerned meals in the community, but we can go beyond this and extend this characterization as far as chapter 34, once it is understood that the purpose of the visits of deacons described in this chapter is to take food to the sick. Again we may attribute this to P, though both <sup>R</sup>El and <sup>R</sup>CN have added their own material. After this, in the <sup>R</sup>El redaction of *Apostolic Tradition*, a brief section on the conduct of a Christian in the morning is added. It is possible to discern that the emphasis here is on the attendance at church in order that instruction should be received. This brings a central interest of <sup>R</sup>El to the fore at the conclusion of the document, and leads therefore neatly to the conclusion.

<sup>R</sup>CN's conclusion is less transparent in its logic and purpose, but has a certain rationale nonetheless. The discussion of the duties of deacons with regard to the sick leads to the precept that deacons should gather with presbyters and then to the care of the cemetery, which was a responsibility of the bishop delegated to a deacon. After this point it picks up the order of <sup>R</sup>El's conclusion, though including material of its own, perhaps derived from a source.

The clarification of the order of chapters in the latter part of *Apostolic Tradition* thus derives from the recognition of the redactional intent of the two conclusions, and from the recognition that it retains the mark of the order in which P was arranged, which is also that of the *Didache*. Moreover the identification of the two redactors and their source material also enables us to see the manner in which the order of *Apostolic Tradition* serves the purpose of

its two redactors. Thus, for instance, the P material on meals is adapted by <sup>R</sup>El to serve the purpose of regulating a Christian's attendance at the school, and <sup>R</sup>El's statement concerning the duties of deacons, which is a means of extending the patronal activity of the bishop, is supplemented in turn by <sup>R</sup>CN in order to stress the manner in which the deacons serve the monepiscopus.

#### VIII THE SCHOLASTIC CHURCH OF THE HIPPOLYTEAN COMMUNITY AND ITS CHURCH ORDER

We have referred throughout this preface to the school of Hippolytus, and to the organization of some of the independent communities which made up the Roman church in the second century as schools. Before concluding this introduction we should explore briefly the phenomenon of the scholastically orientated church in Rome, to see how this may affect our understanding of *Apostolic Tradition*.

At the coming of Christianity to Rome there were already a significant number of independent Jewish teachers in the city and, as Christianity formed itself in part in relationship to this Judaism, so this gave rise to similarly independent Christian teachers. But although these teachers are independent, Hermas has a vision of teachers as part of the overall harmony of churches,<sup>64</sup> presumably exercising functions of catechesis, as an example of whom we may note Grapte, who is to teach the content of Hermas' visions to the women and children.<sup>65</sup> However, we may also note something of a protest from Hermas against a scholastic orientation within the church. Hence the teachers who, with the apostles, provide the foundation of the tower in the ninth *Similitude*, are dead already; they are manifestations of the past.<sup>66</sup> The teachers who remain within the Roman church are those whose responses to questioning and whose teaching is undertaken according to the desire of sinners and for monetary gain.<sup>67</sup> In this way they correspond to the false prophet of



the eleventh Mandate whose mind likewise is on gain, and who answers the questions which are put to him rather than teaching through the medium of the Spirit.<sup>68</sup> A similar picture of questioning is found within the Hippolytean community in chapter 28 of *Apostolic Tradition*, which indicates that there was some conflict between the scholastically based church communities and those church communities, like that of Hermas, which function as households, without concern for the activities of reading, teaching or learning.

The diffuse nature of Roman Christianity in the second century, with its corresponding lack of central authority, meant that the existence of independent Christian teachers continued throughout the century. Among them we may note Cerdo, claimed by Irenaeus as the teacher of Marcion, and Valentinus, as well as Justin and <sup>REL</sup>.<sup>69</sup> We may also note Epiphanius' report of scholastic activity within the Roman church, where there is a debate between Marcion and other Roman teachers on the meaning of the parable of the patch on the wineskin.<sup>70</sup> It would be erroneous to contrast these independent teachers with the official church, as Bardy does,<sup>71</sup> for among the decentralized churches of Rome the schools were simply households among others. If, with the benefit of hindsight, the heretics predominate among the Roman schools, this is in part the result of the nature of the philosophical activity which took place within them, and in part because the majority of the schools were unremarkable and therefore unreported. The demise of the schools only begins with the establishment of a monarchical episcopate in Rome, at which point the households have taken on many scholastic functions in any event, to form something recognizable to us as the church. Bardy points to Victor as the originator of this demise,<sup>72</sup> though we have already noted that the process did not end with Victor. In speaking of the Hippolytean school, therefore, we are referring to a form of Christian community which is common enough in Rome.

The Christian school was a sub-type of the ancient school. Culpepper defines the characteristics of ancient schools as the pur-

suit of the ideal of fellowship or friendship embodied in communal celebration, a sense of tradition as the means of passing down the wisdom of a founder, a concern for discipleship as the outworking of philosophical wisdom, a pre-occupation with reading, teaching and study, and an ambivalent attitude to those outside the school, who whilst potential converts or learners are nonetheless defined as those who are not members. Whereas not all of these characteristics are exclusive to ancient schools since, as Culpepper notes, a number of these characteristics are shared by sects,<sup>73</sup> the simultaneous appearance of these characteristics in any ancient social group provides us with a good case for viewing that group as a school.

The Hippolytean community may be viewed as a school on those criteria. It clearly enjoyed communal celebrations as a means of building up their fellowship, although they are tightly regulated. There is a clear sense of tradition, the maintenance of which is the reason for the redaction of *Apostolic Tradition*, whereas the concern for learning is so great that attendance at instruction takes priority over private prayer. We may also note the extraordinary length of the catechumenate, which is comparable to the time which it took to gain initiation into other ancient philosophical communities.<sup>74</sup> This is the setting from which the works of the two authors and heads of the school emanated. Beyond *Apostolic Tradition* there are many other hints at this orientation. Callistus, for instance, is seen by <sup>REI</sup> in scholastic terms,<sup>75</sup> and <sup>REI</sup>'s *Homily on the Psalms* describes the hearers as pupils, and the church as a school of grace.<sup>76</sup> At the time of <sup>REI</sup> however, the teacher is the bishop, who is of course one of other bishops within the city. By the time of the reconciliation with Pontianus a change has taken place which is well represented by the ordination prayers for presbyters, which uses the image of presbyters sharing a common spirit with the bishop as that of Moses was shared with the elders (presbyters). By now the presbyters have become teachers in their own right in communion with the bishop, and are themselves agents for the transmission of the tradition. This is the view of presbyterate which is represented by *Against Noetus*, which

refers to the tradition of the blessed presbyters, and by *Apostolic Tradition* 41, which refers to the "presbyters who gave us the tradition."

This reconciliation with the wider Roman church, however, is also a reconciliation of other conflicts within the Hippolytean community to which *Apostolic Tradition* bears witness. Again, the main argument will be kept for the commentary, and a bald statement alone is given here.

Although it is possible, on the basis of their functions, to distinguish the churches based on a school from those which were simply households, the school is also a subtype of the ancient household, which is the basis on which all the independent churches of Rome were originally ordered. As a result, there would be a close relationship between the leadership model employed by the church and that of the household. A *paterfamilias* would be head of the church by virtue of being head of his household, this providing one basis by which leadership within the church might come about.<sup>77</sup> Particular evidence for this is to be found in the manner in which the virtue of hospitality, which is an indication of a domestic Christianity, is exalted by Hermas, and the location of this hospitality is said to be the homes of the leaders.<sup>78</sup> From this Maier deduces reasonably that the references to leaders and churches in Hermas' work are references to "various house churches and their patrons."<sup>79</sup> The role of patronage which Maier notices here is of particular significance, since leadership depended upon the ability to act as patron, on ownership of a house in which the church might meet.

These patrons appear in *Apostolic Tradition*, most prominently in the work of <sup>REL</sup>. It is significant first to note that the preface recognizes that there is a plurality of leaders in the church.<sup>80</sup> These leaders however are contrasted with those who have right beliefs, and this tension is the cause for the redaction of *Apostolic Tradition* by <sup>REL</sup>; the probability is that the word which stood in this place in the Greek version was *pro-istamenoï*,<sup>81</sup> which means precisely patrons. The opponents of these patrons, those who are well-taught, may be identified with the bishops, since this is the qualification, rather than

wealth, which is required of leadership in a scholastic household. In what follows, the ordering of an episcopal ordination, it is possible to discern a significant diminution in the role of the presbyters, with a corresponding exaltation of the bishop. We may thus deduce that the plurality of leaders are the presbyters, and that the presbyters had acted in the Hippolytean community as patrons, over whom it is necessary for the bishop to exercise some control. Evidence for this association is to be found in the work of Hermas, who refers to patron-presbyters;<sup>82</sup> indeed, the tension between Hermas and the scholastic communities is an external manifestation of that same tension, since Hermas is himself a patron. The role of patronage, and <sup>R</sup>El's agendum of exalting the bishop at the presbyter-patrons' expense, appears again in chapter 28, where the bishop is given rights which would normally belong to a host in the Graeco-Roman world, even while the outward appearance of the rituals and activities of patronage is maintained. Patrons might employ teachers in their household, which would mean that the teaching presented might be controlled. The tension within the scholastic household thus derives from this demand which a bishop, as teacher, might make for a monopoly in the teaching functions of the church at the expense of the power of the presbyters, even though that teacher might not have the social status or wealth which would fit him to head a community. The conflict within the scholastic community is thus resolved as patrons cease to exercise power overtly, and the scholastic community is victorious over the household as the presbyters take on the teaching role of the bishop and cease to be patrons altogether; the stage is thus set for the professionalization of the clergy and ultimately for the move out of the private house into the basilica.

This interpretation of the conflicts behind *Apostolic Tradition* should be contrasted to that which usually prevails. For, since the work of Hennecke, the assumption has been that the opponents are the bishops, namely Callistus and Zephyrinus. However, apart from the fact that there was no powerful *monepiscopus* in Rome at the time of <sup>R</sup>El, *Apostolic Tradition* 1 states that there are a plurality of

leaders. The identification of the leaders with the *monepiscopus* Callistus, an identification which ignores the fact that the verb employed is plural, leads Stam to identify the well-taught as the charismatically endowed laity, who are to hold the bishop in check.<sup>83</sup> This is a ludicrous claim in the light of the preface to the *Refutation*, and one which, by ignoring the social setting of the Hippolytean community, manages to express the precise opposite of the reality.

In this light we may return briefly to the section on charismata which preceded the extant *Apostolic Tradition*. Although this is no longer extant, the first two chapters of *Apostolic Constitutions* 8 may give us some idea of its contents.<sup>84</sup> Its purpose appears to be a subordination of charismata, including prophecy, to the fundamental gift of true faith. In this it reflects likewise the struggle with the household church, for prophecy was the fundamental medium of communication within those households. This bears every mark of being the work of <sup>R</sup>El. Prophecy, the fundamental means of communication in the household, must be subordinated to the transmission of orthodox teaching. Thus this is entirely in line with the approach taken in the *Homily on the Psalms*, and reflects the same struggle between prophetic households and scholastic communities which is reflected in Hermas' eleventh *Mandate*, in which Hermas the prophet contrasts his own true prophecy to that of the false prophet, who is seated on a chair in the manner of a Graeco-Roman teacher. The greater part of *Apostolic Tradition* is concerned with the patrons; since prophecy is in any event in decline by the end of the second century, less attention needs to be given to it, but this section stands nonetheless as a monument to the argument which had led to the triumph of the teacher over the prophet.

Prophets acted in households, and might, like John of Patmos, who was an independent prophet in the households of Asia Minor, be independent of the structures of leadership or might, like Hermas, be both householder, legitimating leadership through traditional means, and prophet, legitimating communication (though not necessarily leadership) through a claim of Spirit-possession. In

the school, however, leadership based on household-ownership is ultimately incompatible with communication based on the transmission of authoritative tradition, since it is vital that those transmitting the tradition should by the same means govern the household, just as communication based on spiritual insights (prophecy) is likewise incompatible with communication which is based on authoritative teaching. Once teaching takes over from prophecy as the fundamental means of communication within the church, a takeover which is complete except for a few pockets of resistance by the time that <sup>R</sup>El writes, it is only a matter of time before the teacher takes the reins of the household. *Apostolic Tradition* bears witness in the greater part to this second stage of the struggle.<sup>85</sup>

Finally we may observe that the paschal tables found on the statue also bear witness to this reconciliation, in that rather than being Quartodeciman and showing that Pascha should be kept on the fourteenth of the Jewish month Nisan, which was the practice to which Victor had objected and which <sup>R</sup>El had followed, it is to be kept on a Sunday, in accordance with the practice of other Roman Christians.

Despite this reconciliation, and the triumph of the teacher over the patron, the community might still benefit from patronage. Lampe notes that there was significant influx of senators from the east of the Empire under the Severans, a period in which Christianity is found in the senatorial classes, especially in the east of the Empire, and a rise in the social status of Christians in Rome, all of which phenomena, Lampe suggests, are related.<sup>86</sup> This might well assist the Hippolytean community as a Greek-speaking church in the city. It is perhaps at this time that the community gained its statue. The provision of statuary was a recognized act of patronage in the Empire, and as such was obviously the preserve of the wealthy. Comparisons between ancient and modern currency are difficult because of the great disparity in income levels which existed at the time, but it is to be noted that a statue of this size generally cost in

the region of 4000 sesterces,<sup>87</sup> a context for which figure is provided by the annual pay of a Roman legionary of 900 sesterces, from which deductions were made for food and clothing. In addition, the plinth to the statue, which would have cost something in the region of 300 sesterces, was newly supplied, and would have involved further expenditure on the part of the congregation. The statue thus represents a significant investment on behalf of the school and thus the statue, as well as being a monument to the reconciliation of the Hippolytean school to the wider Roman church, is a monument to the reconciliation of the patronal classes to the prerogatives of the teaching clergy.

#### IX THE TEXT OF *APOSTOLIC TRADITION*<sup>88</sup>

*Apostolic Tradition* was written in Greek, but only a few fragments are still extant in that language. *Apostolic Tradition* is, however, extant in a number of translations and versions. The translation in this book is therefore a translation of translations and, as will be apparent in the notes on the text and translation, we frequently have no certainty of the underlying original text. Botte called his version "an attempt at a reconstruction," which is all that any version of *Apostolic Tradition* can be.

Apart from the fragments, the following versions are available, and are used as the bases of this translation, as indicated in the notes on text and translation.

##### a) *Latin*

A Latin version of much of *Apostolic Tradition* is extant in a single manuscript dating from the fifth century. This was a palimpsest, a manuscript which had been written over. There are gaps in the translation, and inevitably there are copyist's and translator's errors, compounded undoubtedly by errors in the Greek manuscript from which the translator worked. However, the translation appears to be

largely faithful to the Greek, as it is painstakingly literal. Dix states that "in places the style is like nothing so much as the 'English' of Dutch bulb catalogues."<sup>89</sup> Because of its early date and literal manner this is certainly the best witness to the writing of Hippolytus where it is available. There are however several lacunae in the version.

b) *Coptic (Sahidic and Bohairic)*

The Sahidic version, in a manuscript dating from the eleventh century, is almost complete and was made from a Greek manuscript. There is, however, a lacuna in the section on baptism, and other material, most notably the ordination prayers, are missing. The Bohairic version was made from the Sahidic version in the early nineteenth century and is of little value except that it enables us to plug the gap in the section concerning baptism.

c) *Arabic*

The translation into Arabic was carried out from a Sahidic version around the thirteenth century. It is of little value therefore except when the Sahidic is wanting.

d) *Ethiopic*

The Ethiopic translation was made from an Arabic version, which had itself been rendered from a Sahidic version, though not that which is presently extant. However, although it is late, occasionally confused, and derivative, this version is invaluable as it contains some material which is not to be found in any other version, due to the lacunae in the Latin translation and the omissions in the Sahidic version.

It will thus be noted that, although there are translations into four languages, this is a stemma with only two branches, as the Arabic and Ethiopic versions are ultimately dependent on an earlier version of the Sahidic translation than that we currently possess, though this in itself means that a truly simple stemma cannot be drawn.



In addition to the translations of *Apostolic Tradition*, there are some adaptations of its material in existence. Because they are thorough rewritings of the text, they can be of limited use in reconstructing Hippolytus' writing; for although on occasion they are close to *Apostolic Tradition*, this can only be recognized where the text of *Apostolic Tradition* is already fairly secure, and so they add little to our knowledge. However, they may assist where some aspect of the translations is doubtful or where there is significant divergence among the versions, and they lend reassurance concerning the authenticity of some of the material which is otherwise found only in the Ethiopic translation, which does contain much that is late and extraneous. These are:

a) *The canons of Hippolytus*

This is a reworking and adaptation of *Apostolic Tradition*, generally agreed to derive from fourth-century Alexandria. It is now extant only in an Arabic version.

b) *Testamentum Domini*

This is a church order in its own right, a discourse put into the mouth of Jesus, though its compiler employed and expanded *Apostolic Tradition* in the construction of the order. On occasion *Testamentum Domini* is close to its source, but is more often a glass through which the original may be seen darkly as a result of the expansions and interpolations made by the compiler. Its date and provenance are debated, though a late fourth century date and Syrian provenance seem likely. It is extant in Syriac.

c) *Apostolic Constitutions*, 8

The *Apostolic Constitutions* is a collection of reworked church order literature, using the Syrian *Didascalia*, the *Didache* and, in the eighth book, *Apostolic Tradition*. It is again a product of the late fourth century, and Syrian in origin.

d) The epitome of *Apostolic Constitutions*, 8

Although an epitome dependent upon *Apostolic Constitutions*, this document on occasion, such as the episcopal ordination prayer, has referred back to the original *Apostolic Tradition*, and thus preserves for us the original Greek. The work is probably Syrian, and perhaps fifth-century.

The oldest extant version of each chapter is used as the basis for the translation. Thus, apart from the occasions where Greek fragments are available, the Latin version is employed as the base version, followed by the Sahidic when the Latin has lacunae, followed by the Ethiopic, which preserves material which is not to be found in the other versions. Although the base versions employed are discussed in the notes on the text in every chapter, they are shown in table 2, for convenience of reference. However, where there are compelling reasons, such as the agreement of several versions against the base-version, recourse has been made to supplementation and occasionally to conjectural emendation in search of a Greek original. At every point, however, departures from the base version are described and discussed in the notes on text and translation. The translation itself, however, presents the conclusions reached, even when they are based on conjecture. In view of the complex textual history of this document, there are two courses open to a translator or editor. There is the approach of Cuming, which is to translate one text as a base text and to propose variants in footnotes.<sup>90</sup> However, the text is sometimes so obscure that any translation is itself conjectural, with the result that it is not possible to follow this approach with any consistency. The alternative is that of Dix, which is to present what seems to the editor the most likely original in the light of the available material and, by making clear his method and logic at every contentious occasion, allow the reader to determine whether he be right.<sup>91</sup> This approach is not without its difficulties, but it is that which is essayed here.<sup>92</sup> On occasions the translator's nerve has failed, however, and resort is made to square brackets, which indi-

cate words which stand in the versions but which, in the translator's opinion, are interpolations; and angled brackets, which indicate that words absent from any version are being supplied in order to make sense of a passage. On two occasions, where significant and new conjectural emendation is proposed, the reader is further alerted with a note.

## X A SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

We have defended the origin of *Apostolic Tradition* or, more accurately, *Apostolic Tradition concerning Spiritual Gifts*, in third-century Rome, and have located its production in a school associated with the name of Hippolytus. Two authors are responsible for this document as it stands, the first of whom is also responsible for the *Refutation of all Heresies*, and the second of whom is also responsible for *Against the Heresy of one Noetus*. The first was a presbyter-bishop in a Roman school at the beginning of the third century, a social and theological conservative who opposed the growth of the Roman monepiscopate. The second was a presbyter in the same school, who was reconciled to the wider Roman church under its episcopal leader Pontianus. The first author, represented as <sup>R</sup>El, took an ancient document of a recognized genre, represented as P, and submitted it to an extensive interpolation in order to boost his particular agendum of exalting the bishop, as a teacher who might be without social standing, above the presbyters, who might act as patrons within the school. Thus he brings episcopal ordination to the head of the document. The second author, represented as <sup>R</sup>CN, as a result of the reconciliation of this school with the wider Roman church, re-edited the work of <sup>R</sup>El, perhaps employing sources of his own, and made it useable in the united community, in particular through redefining the role of presbyters away from patronage and into participation with the bishop in the work of teaching.

Before concluding, we may reflect briefly on the nature of this

enterprise. It would be naïve in the extreme to read *Apostolic Tradition* as a simple description of Roman liturgy in the early third century, though this is the manner in which past commentators have tended to view the work. By contrast we have adopted Brent's position that the purpose of *Apostolic Tradition* is not simply to describe a social (or ecclesial) reality but also to assist in constructing one.<sup>93</sup> This opens up the question, however, of the extent to which the liturgies described and directed really reflect the conduct of the Hippolytean church, or whether they are simply idealizations of an armchair liturgist.<sup>94</sup> P material, particularly that concerning the catechumenate and baptism, is, we may state, genuinely descriptive because of the extent to which it coheres with later practice. <sup>R</sup>El's material is likewise perhaps genuinely descriptive, even if it has a prescriptive function as well, for the triumph which <sup>R</sup>El sought to engineer came about. Whether the liturgical directions given in *Apostolic Tradition* were actually the means of the triumph, or whether their appearance in a church order represents that the triumph is complete and that a literary monument to that victory is being erected, is another question. <sup>R</sup>CN's material, insofar as it is to a large extent the adaptation of material from outside of the school, thus marking the reconciliation with the community represented by Pontianus, is perhaps purely a literary product, although because of the independent nature of the material it may to an extent represent a reality, even if it is not that of the Hippolytean school.

*Apostolic Tradition* is thus a multilayered work, representing both ancient tradition and the social struggles of a Roman community in the third century. The result of the series of reconciliations which were brought about, between the patrons and the bishops, the scholastic communities with the households, and the Quartodecimans with those who celebrated on a Sunday, is the church represented by *Apostolic Tradition*. The document thus stands as a literary monument to the struggles of the Hippolytean community, just as the statue which once stood in the library of that community bears concrete witness to the same struggles, and to their resolution.

Table One

## REDACTIONAL LEVELS IN APOSTOLIC TRADITION

1-3	<sup>R</sup> El
4-9	<sup>R</sup> El reworked by <sup>R</sup> CN**
10-14	<sup>R</sup> CN
15-21	P reworked by <sup>R</sup> El**
22	<sup>R</sup> CN*
23	<sup>R</sup> El
24	<sup>R</sup> CN*
25-27	P
28-29	<sup>R</sup> El reworked by <sup>R</sup> CN**
30	<sup>R</sup> CN*
31	<sup>R</sup> El*
32	P
33	<sup>R</sup> El reworked by <sup>R</sup> CN
34	<sup>R</sup> El
35	<sup>R</sup> El
36-38	P
42A, 43A	<sup>R</sup> El
39-40	<sup>R</sup> CN
41	<sup>R</sup> CN* reworking of <sup>R</sup> El's 35
42B	<sup>R</sup> CN reworking of <sup>R</sup> El's 42A
43B	<sup>R</sup> El's conclusion in <sup>R</sup> CN's recension

\*Indicates probable employment of a source.

\*\*The precise extent of reworking is suggested in the commentary.

Table Two

## VERSIONS USED AS BASES FOR TRANSLATION

Chapters	Base version
1-2	Latin
3	Epitome
4-8.10	Latin
8.11-12	<i>Testamentum Domini</i>
9-10	Sahidic
11	Epitome
12-21.14	Sahidic
21.15-37	Latin
21.37-40	Sahidic
22	Ethiopic
23	Epitome
24.1-2	Ethiopic
24.3-4	<i>Testamentum Domini</i>
25	Ethiopic
26	Sahidic
27-31.2	Latin
27.3-5	Greek (fragment)
32-35	Latin
36	Greek (fragment)
37-38, 42A, 43A	Latin
39-41.8	Sahidic
41.9-18, 42B, 43B.1	Latin
43B2-4	Sahidic

# The Apostolic Tradition concerning Spiritual Gifts of the School of Hippolytus

## English version and commentary

The following abbreviations are used throughout the commentary:

<sup>R</sup>El: The redactor of *Apostolic Tradition* who was also the author of the *Refutation of all Heresies* (the *Elenchus*) and was active at the beginning of the third century.

<sup>R</sup>CN: The redactor of *Apostolic Tradition* who was also the author of the work *Against the Heresy of one Noetus* (*Contra Noetum*) and was martyred in the year 235.

P: *Paradosis*, or tradition, the original work which <sup>R</sup>El edited to create the first edition of *Apostolic Tradition*.

For a fuller explanation of these terms and their rationale, see the introduction pp. 24–32.

The chapter enumeration of Botte is employed, with that of Dix added in brackets. For ease of reference, the verses of Dix are retained, though renumbered to accord with the different chapter divisions.

Occasional resort is made to the following brackets:

< >: Words which do not appear in any text or version, but which are added in order to make sense in English.

[ ]: Words which appear in one or more versions, but which the present editor believes are later interpolations.

1:

*1* Those things, then, concerning spiritual gifts, which are worthy of note, we have set forth. God gave these gifts to people in the beginning in accordance with his will, presenting them with his own image, which had been lost. *2* And now, out of love for all the saints, we have reached the summit of the tradition which is proper for the churches, *3* so that those who are well-taught should guard the tradition which has come down to us now, and which we are now going to consider, and so be confirmed in their knowledge. *4* Because of the error or falling-away that has now come about through ignorance, and through those who are ignorant, *5* the Holy Spirit gives perfect grace to those who rightly believe, so that they should know in what manner those who are pre-eminent in the church should defend and pass on all these things.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

*1:* The Latin version of this prologue is often meaningless. The Ethiopic text would appear to derive from a different Greek text altogether,<sup>1</sup> and the fact that this prologue appears in the middle of the Ethiopic version is indicative that it has come from a different text from the rest of the version. There is also a Syriac version extant which at times, alongside the Ethiopic text, allows corrections to the Latin.<sup>2</sup> This first verse is translated following Dix's interpretation and correction of the text's tortuous Latin;<sup>3</sup> Botte's suggestions are close to those of Dix.<sup>4</sup>

*2:* The Latin version, which Dix follows, takes the love as that of God, whereas here we have followed Botte who, on the basis of the Syriac version, recognizes that the love in question is that of the author.<sup>5</sup>

For "which is proper for the churches" the Latin version has "which catechizes the churches," which is clearly meaningless. Dix suggests that the Greek word *kathēkei* (is proper) has been misread as *katēchei* (catechizes).<sup>6</sup>

*3:* For "well-taught" (*docti*) the Latin has "well-led" (*ducti*). The Ethiopic version preserves the correct reading.

*4–5:* It is not clear whether those who should know are the well-taught (so Dix), which is the understanding adopted here,<sup>7</sup> or the ignorant (so Botte).<sup>8</sup> Either reading is possible. Botte's reading is based on the identification of the leaders with the well-taught, whereas Dix's reading is that of the Ethiopic translator. This reading is adopted here



on the grounds of context, in that <sup>8</sup>El may be read as stating that the *pro-istamenoï* are ignorant, and are to blame for the fall of the church into heresy, whereas those who are well-taught are not necessarily in charge (though they should be).

5: For the word "pre-eminent" (Latin: *qui ecclesiae praesunt*) the Syriac has "bishops" and Ethiopic has "stand," both of which indicate that the possible word which stood in the Greek was *pro-istamenoï*. Support for this reading may be found in the Sahidic version of 43B, which preserves the Greek word in the same context. On the significance of this term see the comment below.

#### COMMENT

1: As discussed in the introduction, this is hardly the opening of a book, referring back to a previous work, but a change in tack within a single work.

1-5: Despite uncertainties of translation the key themes of *Apostolic Tradition* emerge here. The treatise is intended to lay out the content of the tradition and the manner in which it is to be passed down. The audience is those who are well-taught, and those who are to undertake the handing-down are those who are pre-eminent, who are implicitly identified with the ignorant and as the cause of the slippage from the truth. We suggested above that this word renders *pro-istamenoï*, and intend to suggest here that this is a reference to those who acted as patrons in the church. For whereas it is tempting to identify the ignorant who had caused slippage from the truth with Zephyrinus and Callistus,<sup>9</sup> the issues which *Apostolic Tradition* seems designed to confront would appear to be internal issues; we should moreover note that there is a plurality of leaders mentioned here, rather than a single bishop. Were Zephyrinus and Callistus ever part of the Hippolytean community, or <sup>8</sup>El ever part of theirs, then the identification might be made, but it is clear from the work of Lampe and Brent that Hippolytus' community was entirely separate; it may have enjoyed a degree of communion, but the dispute with these presbyter-bishops would lead to renewed separation, rather than the internal debate which is implied here. Since *Apostolic Tradition* here implies that the dispute is internal, so we must identify the *pro-istamenoï* within the Hippolytean community as the opponents.

Hermas makes mention of *pro-istamenoï* when he speaks of *presbuteroi pro-istamenoï*,<sup>10</sup> which is, Maier deduces, a reference to "various house churches and their patrons";<sup>11</sup> it is to be noted here that presbyters and patrons were functionally identical, indeed that Hermas himself is both

leader and patron of his own community.<sup>12</sup> Leadership thus depended upon wealth, the possession of a house, and so the ability to act as *pro-istamenos* depended on the possibility that one might also act as *prostatis* (patron) to the church. There is thus an ambiguity in the word *pro-istamenos*, by which both governance and patronage might be indicated. Given the necessity for domestic Christianity to have wealthy leaders who might also give social support to the church it is quite possible that the *pro-istamenoí* are both leaders and patrons.<sup>13</sup> It is significant that here in *Apostolic Tradition* the patrons are picked out as having power, and as being separate from those who are well-taught; those who are well taught have the Holy Spirit as their patron (the Latin word used of the Spirit here, *praestante*, could well represent *pro-istamenos*). It is this tension between the *pro-istamenoí* and the well-taught which is fundamental to the understanding of *Apostolic Tradition* presented in this commentary, and which begins to emerge in the rites of ordination, which, uncoincidentally, follow the prologue. The agendum of *Apostolic Tradition* is that of transferring oversight from the patrons to the bishop, who is to be a person of education. This is the light in which we will seek to interpret the rest of this document. We should also suggest that this agendum is the intent of the primary redactor,<sup>14</sup> and that this preface is his work. His statement concerning the grace given by the Holy Spirit to those who rightly believe is close to his statements, in *Refutation Proem*. 6 and 7, that the Holy Spirit's teaching of truth has been passed from the apostles to those who believe rightly. *Apostolic Tradition* is a witness to a power struggle between those for whom knowledge is power, and those whose power resides in their wealth.

## 2: On bishops

<sup>1</sup>Let the bishop be ordained as we appointed above, having been elected by all the people. <sup>2</sup>When he has been named and found pleasing to all, let the people come together with the presbyters, and any bishops who are present, on the Lord's day. <sup>3</sup>When all give their consent they lay hands on him, and the presbytery stands in silence. <sup>4</sup>And all shall keep silence, praying in their heart for the descent of the Holy Spirit. <sup>5</sup>After

*this, at the request of all, one of the bishops who is present, laying a hand on him who is being ordained bishop, shall pray thus:*

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

1: The phrase "as we appointed above" does not occur in the Latin version, but appears in all other versions of this text. It is hard to see how it could have entered if it were not already present in the text, but easy to see how it might be omitted. It probably refers to the earlier discussion of spiritual gifts, though what precisely was appointed there is less clear.

The Sahidic reads "from" the people. It is easy to see how the Sahidic version could change "by" to "from" as Coptic does not have a passive and expresses the passive solely through a preposition meaning "by" or "through" (*ebol hitn*); the preposition which means "from" (*ebol hem*) is however almost identical.

The Sahidic version adds "being in all things without fault." Although it is hard to explain how this would drop out, it is easy, given the attested use of I Timothy 3.2 at ordinations, to see how this became inserted.

2: The Sahidic version mentions the people and the presbyters, and adds the deacons, but makes no mention of bishops. Botte however believes that the text is intact because of its proximity to the text found in *Apostolic Constitutions*.<sup>14</sup> Although it is possible to respond that *Apostolic Constitutions* here represents the normal procedure at this later date, the same may apply to the Sahidic text, which may be equally well explained by seeing the text as conformed to the usual order of an Egyptian ordination of a later date, beginning with an assembly at a cathedral, where it is assumed that the bishops are already present.

#### COMMENT

1: The Sahidic version, which states that the bishop is elected from the people, rather than by the people (see under text and translation) led Ratcliff,<sup>15</sup> followed by Bradshaw,<sup>16</sup> to suggest that this was the original reading, and that the bishop was originally chosen directly from the *laos*. From this Ratcliff deduced that it was impossible to move through the orders of ministry in this period. We saw in the section on the translation that the differing version was easily explained, and may note here that there is absolutely no historical ground for such a suggestion to be maintained, unless there was radical change within the next few years, for when Cornelius, in the middle of the third century, became bishop of Rome he had passed through every ecclesiastical office and order en route.<sup>17</sup>

Ratcliff speculates moreover that the earlier section, which he believed to be a separate treatise, gave full directions for an election.<sup>18</sup> In view of the subject matter of the section, and in view of the potential conflicts between different kinds of legitimization of authority in the church, it is more likely to have insisted on the appointment and ordination of a bishop, rather than giving precise instructions only to repeat them here.

2: Based on the Sahidic text, which, as was noted in the discussion of the text and translation of this verse above, is weak evidence, Bradshaw suggests that the mention of bishops here is secondary. Further to his questioning of the integrity of the Latin text he argues that if the text comes from early in the third century it is the first mention of the presence of other bishops at an ordination, and that the other bishops mentioned then fade into the background as the new bishop concelebrates with his presbyters.<sup>19</sup> He therefore deduces that the text is interpolated. However the situation described fits the early third century very well, for this is the period in which there is a strengthening of the status of the *episkopos* within the Hippolytean community. The rite of episcopal ordination by another bishop moreover probably grew out of a custom of the second century, since despite the diversified origins of Christianity in the city there was clearly a growing realization in the second century that the unity of the diverse churches within the city needed to be fostered; it is quite probable that this realization would receive liturgical expression through the participation of neighboring presbyter-bishops in the appointment of one of their number. Given the necessity of maintaining communion it is entirely natural that these *episkopoi* should have a hand in the appointment one of their number. Thus the bishops who are to be present at this ordination are not other bishops from outside Rome, present to assure the succession of the Roman Bishop, rather they are bishops from within Rome, effectively presbyters, present at the ordination of a Roman bishop among others. The peace of the church which this is meant to ensure is not that of the *oikoumenē*, but simply that of the city.

3: Three things are curious about this verse: the further election implied (even though the bishop is already elected), the absence of a subject for the verb ("they" lay hands) and the silence of the presbytery. The latter two problems will be dealt with together, since the solution proposed binds the two together.

The procedure of double election here may seem repetitious, but does

seem to have been practised; a prior semi-private poll is now being affirmed by acclamation in a public assembly. This pattern of private poll followed by public acclamation is not unique to *Apostolic Tradition*. *The Life of Polycarp*, a fictional account of Polycarp's life, probably written in Smyrna in the late third century,<sup>20</sup> similarly has a double election, in which Polycarp, chosen in advance, is acclaimed in the public assembly after the deacons had enquired of the people whom they desired for their bishop; much stress is laid upon the unanimity of the election,<sup>21</sup> in common with "when all give their consent" found here. Not only is the duplication not unique, it can be readily explained through the social conditions of the Hippolytean school. The double election, or rather the election of a candidate who had already been elected, derives from the tension between the positions of the bishop and the patrons. The candidate who had been chosen is publicly elected since the nomination of the patron, who would normally make the appointment of a teacher in what is effectively his own household, needs to be confirmed by the community beyond his *clientela*. Support for reading the episcopal ordination rite as a response to the social domination of patrons in the Hippolytean school may be gained by noting with Brent that it is Abraham rather than Moses who is the type of the priest who is chosen, since Abraham is a priest who is also a leader, rather than being subject, as was Aaron, to one who was not a priest.<sup>22</sup> These patrons, who form the presbyterate, are the *pro-istamenoí* of the preface. They are being directed through this document to yield their power to the people, and thus to the bishop.

The second curious point is that this laying on of hands has no subject, and takes place as the presbytery is enjoined to silence. The verb could conceivably refer to the bishops who were mentioned in passing,<sup>23</sup> but equally possibly it is a reference to a collective laying on of hands by all those who are present<sup>24</sup> or, as Bradshaw suggests, to a silent laying on of hands by the presbytery.<sup>25</sup> The presbytery is thus present, and lay their hands on the candidate, but are directed not to pray out loud at this point. Given that the episcopal ordination described is the ordination of a leading presbyter, the most probable explanation of the verb "they lay" is that the presbyters lay their hands on one of their number. Quite why the presbyters are not to pray aloud is less clear, but that <sup>18</sup>El is seeking to direct practice in a particular direction is not impossible. Walls is open to the idea that some controversy concerning the role of presbyters in ordinations might be hinted at, but

finds it strange that there should be such controversy "at this stage."<sup>26</sup> Presumably he thinks that the stage is the late second century; however, if Brent's reconstruction is correct it is quite possible to see that, if an earlier tradition of presbyteral appointment has now given way to episcopal ordination by a bishop with whom the church is in communion, it might well be necessary to curtail the activities of presbyters in this way, and at this very stage in the development of the order of the Hippolytean community. The presbyters are thus directed not to pray out loud, but their action of laying on hands is retained, though now subordinated to an episcopal handlaying.<sup>27</sup>

4: Dix suggests that this action might have been the original consecration.<sup>28</sup> Whereas there is some merit in this suggestion, it is more likely to have been part of the election, and that the presbyters were so to pray. As it stands however it looks like a reference to the following ordination prayer, and so it is all the more necessary that silence should be enjoined on the presbyters who, by virtue of their functions as patrons, might previously have offered the prayer of consecration, rather than one of the visiting bishops as is the case in the practice proposed by <sup>R</sup>El here.

5: We have interpreted the presence of other bishops at this ordination as a means by which the unity of the churches in Rome might be strengthened and demonstrated. We have also suggested that the rites indicate subordination of a powerful patron-presbyterate to episcopal control. The delegation of the ordination prayer to one of these bishops may be understood in the same light.

### 3: Prayer for the ordination of a bishop

*1 God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Father of mercies and God of all consolation, you dwell in the heights and look upon the lowly, you know all things before they come to be, 2 you set limits in the church through your word of grace, you foreordained from the beginning a righteous race from Abraham, you established rulers and priests, and have not left your sanctuary without ministers, from the foundation of the world you were well pleased to be glorified in those you have cho-*

sen. <sup>3</sup>Even now pour out from yourself the power of the Spirit of governance, which you gave to your beloved child Jesus Christ, which he gave to the holy apostles, who set up the church in every place as your sanctuary, for the unceasing glory and praise of your name. <sup>4</sup>Father, you know the heart; grant that your servant, whom you have chosen for oversight, should shepherd your flock and should serve before you as high priest without blame, serving by night and day, ceaselessly propitiating your countenance and offering the gifts of your holy church. <sup>5</sup>And let him have the power of high priesthood, to forgive sins according to your command, to assign duties according to your command, to loose every tie according to the power which you gave to the apostles, to please you in gentleness and with a pure heart, offering you the scent of sweetness. <sup>6</sup>Through your child Jesus Christ, through whom be glory and might and honor to you, with the Holy Spirit in the holy church, now and to the ages of the ages. Amen.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

The text of this prayer is extant in Greek through the epitome. While this translation has employed the Greek version, it is far from perfect. The differences between the versions can sometimes be explained through erroneous translation on the Latin translator's part, but on occasion the Latin version is preferred to the Greek.

2: The word translated "glorified," Greek *doxasthēnai*, is "given" in the Latin version, but this can be explained by the Latin translator misreading the Greek as *dothēnai*.

3: The word translated "sanctuary" in this verse is in the accusative in Latin, which makes sense, whereas the epitome has the noun in the genitive which, as Botte points out, is impossible.<sup>29</sup>

Moreover, in this verse however there is a difference between the versions, which leads to genuine uncertainty. Whereas the Latin version, translated above, states that the Spirit of Lordship was given by the Father to Christ and given by Christ to the apostles, the Greek reads: "which you gave through your beloved child Jesus Christ, to his holy apostles . . ." Walls believes that the Latin text has been interpolated, specifically, he thinks, by an Arian of the fourth century, and he sees evidence for Arian intervention particularly in this part of the prayer.<sup>30</sup> However, as Stam observes, the manner in which the Spirit (or more precisely the necessary spiritual gifts) are seen as mediated from Christ to the apostles and thence to the new bishop is entirely in keeping with the apparently Johannine origins of the Hippolytean community and

the emphasis on succession which is to be found within that community, and in particular with the manner in which the gifts of the Spirit are to be seen as mediated to the church from the apostles.<sup>31</sup> Therefore the Latin has been preferred. The Ethiopic version would also tend to support the Latin, although it has confusions of its own.<sup>32</sup> Although it is possible to explain the Greek version through haplography, it is more probable that the epitomist has sought to correct the theology of the original, as Dix suggests, by avoiding subordinationism.<sup>33</sup>

6: "In the holy church" is only attested in the Ethiopic version. Its occurrence elsewhere in the doxologies of *Apostolic Tradition* leads Botte to include it here.<sup>34</sup> The Latin version here, as in other doxologies, reads: "through your child Christ Jesus, through whom to you be glory and might, to the Father and the Son with the Holy Spirit, now, and for the ages of the ages Amen." This repetition is certainly erroneous, and reflects the liturgical formula known to the translator. Jungmann attempts to defend this form,<sup>35</sup> but a similarly erroneous form involving a repetition of the second person of the trinity is found elsewhere, for instance in the Moscow MS of the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*;<sup>36</sup> it is an easy mistake into which a scribe unused to doxologies of this nature might fall.

#### COMMENT

2: Although Dix translates the word here translated as "limits" as "ordinances"<sup>37</sup> and Botte translates as "règles," commenting here that the Latin translator's rendition of *horous* as *terminos* is a mechanical mistranslation,<sup>38</sup> Brent notes the use of the same term within the *Refutation* to refer to a canonical boundary, for instance in 9.11 which states that Zephyrinus is outside of the boundaries. He suggests that the same usage is that which is found here.<sup>39</sup> He also notes that the term is not found in this sense elsewhere in the Hippolytean corpus. For him this is the principal evidence that this prayer is the work of <sup>R</sup>El.

3: The phrase "Spirit of governance," taken from Psalm 50:14 (51:12 Hebrew) was used originally in a stoic sense, to mean the spirit which is in charge of human functions (the *hēgemonikon*). In this context however it has come to mean a spirit of governance, rather than a governing spirit. This prayer was originally intended for a presbyter who, alongside others, would govern the church on the basis of an ability to offer patronage but, read in the context of the manner in which the Hippolytean community developed, the phrase becomes a means of emphasizing the status of the bishop within the church-school. This is because a teacher need not be of high social status, may



indeed be dependent upon patronage, and the patron might therefore continue to seek to exercise control. Teachers in the ancient world who were without means might support themselves by charging fees but there is no indication that this took place in the Hippolytean school and so we must presume that the bishop was dependent upon patronage.<sup>40</sup> As such he is liable to meet the same fate as the philosopher described by Lucian who is forced by poverty to take up a position under the patronage of a householder, and who finds himself gradually dropping down the social scale at the dinners given by the host.<sup>41</sup> The bishop as leader in the scholastic household is thus being set up by <sup>REI</sup> as a counter to the *pro-istamenoí*.

Secondly we may note the manner in which, in keeping with the theology of the *Refutation*, the spirit of governance is that of Christ, and that it is mediated by him to the apostles. This is precisely the manner in which *Refutation* (Proem.) sets out the manner in which the Spirit is mediated to the church, that is to say it is given by Christ to the apostles, whose successors are the teaching bishops.

4: The hieratic language of the ordination prayer here may be seen, alongside the prayer for a spirit of governance, as a deliberate rhetorical ploy to offset the power of lay patrons with a powerful episcopal president, in order that authority might actually be properly shared within the community.<sup>42</sup>

5: Bradshaw is unable to see how the prayer here might be given a date contemporary with Hippolytus, in part because he can only see the bishop as a *monepiscopus*, and in part because of his suspicion of the hieratic language to be found here, which he finds difficult to place early in the third century.<sup>43</sup> However he does note a parallel in the third century *Didascalia*, and suggests that if this is the earliest point at which the designation is found then it provides an approximate dating for the ordination prayer. However Bradshaw misses the most obvious parallel of all and that is to be found in the Preface to the *Refutation*. The language is the same not only regarding high priesthood but concerning the succession of teaching which the high-priesthood anchors, and these are the grounds on which we may assert that the ordination prayer derived from <sup>REI</sup>.

Besides offering the gifts of the church, the bishop is to forgive and to assign duties. The right of forgiveness implies the power not to forgive, as exercised at *Refutation* 9.12. The assignation of duties, the phrase used here meaning, literally, assign lots, is translated by Cuming as "confer orders."<sup>44</sup>

This could well be the meaning; Acts 1:23–26 refers to the casting of lots for the appointment of Matthias, and by the time of Irenaeus the term “lot” has come to mean simply appointment to the order of clergy in succession.<sup>45</sup> Two caveats however should be entered to the translation: firstly it is to be noted that, if the reconstruction of the history of this community proposed here is valid, the conferral of orders would not be the preserve of the bishop alone at the stage marked by this ordination prayer, though by the time of the ordination prayer for presbyters at chapter 7 below this had become the case. Secondly we should observe that the reference is not to sacramental ordination but simply to appointment.

4<sup>46</sup>

*1 When he has been made bishop let everyone offer him the kiss of peace, greeting him because he has been made worthy. 2 Let the deacons present the oblations to him and, laying hands on it with the whole presbytery, let him say, giving thanks:*

*3 “The Lord be with you.”*

*And all shall say:*

*“And with your spirit.”*

*“Hearts on high,”*

*“We have them to the Lord.”*

*“Let us give thanks.”*

*“It is fitting and right.”*

*And then he shall continue thus:*

*4 We give thanks to you God, through your beloved child Jesus Christ, whom, in the last times, you sent to us as savior and redeemer and angel of your will, 5 who is your inseparable Word through whom you made all things and who was well pleasing to you. 6 You sent him from heaven*

into the womb of a virgin, and he was conceived and made flesh in the womb and shown to be your Son, born of the Holy Spirit and the virgin. <sup>7</sup>He fulfilled your will and won for you a holy people, opening wide his hands when he suffered that he might set free from suffering those who believed in you. <sup>8</sup>When he was handed over to voluntary suffering, in order to dissolve death and break the chains of the devil and harrow hell and illuminate the just and fix a boundary and manifest the resurrection, <sup>9</sup>he took bread and giving thanks to you he said: take, eat, this is my body which will be broken for you. Likewise with the cup saying: this is my blood which is poured out for you. <sup>10</sup>Whenever you do this, you perform my commemoration.

<sup>11</sup>Remembering therefore his death and resurrection, we offer you bread and cup, giving thanks to you because you have held us worthy to stand before you and minister to you as priest.

<sup>12</sup>And we ask that you should send your Holy Spirit on the presbytery of the holy church.<sup>47</sup> Gathering «us» into one, may you grant to all the saints who receive for the fullness of the Holy Spirit, for the confirmation of their faith in truth, <sup>13</sup>that we may praise and glorify you through your child Jesus Christ, through whom be glory and honor to you, with the Holy Spirit in your holy church both now and to the ages of the ages. Amen.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

2: The Sahidic version states that he shall lay his hand (singular) on the offering. This reading is preferred by Dix.<sup>48</sup> Although the Latin implies that the bishop alone lays both hands, it is also possible that the plural results from the plural presbytery. The translation is thus left deliberately vague to reflect this ambiguity.

3: The translation of the second element in the dialogue excludes the second person address familiar to English-speaking Christians since the sixteenth century ("lift up your hearts") since, as Lash points out, it has no place in the wider tradition.<sup>49</sup>

8: The phrase "fix a boundary" is translated here mechanically from the Latin version, the translator of which translated mechanically from the Greek. The word *horos*, which clearly lies behind the Latin here, might mean a boundary or a limit or a rule,

but the author does not specify which, or to what it was a boundary, or of what it was a rule. The interpretation of the phrase is explored in the comment.

10: The Latin, reflected in this translation, is indicative, though the Ethiopic has an imperative. The underlying Greek (*poieite*) could mean either. Dix prefers indicative,<sup>50</sup> Botte imperative,<sup>51</sup> whereas Cuming follows the Latin version and translates with an indicative but implies in his note a preference for imperative!<sup>52</sup>

11: Botte comments: "‘ministrare’ (minister) of the Latin is an inadequate translation. The Ethiopic and the *Testamentum Domini* confirm the *hierateuein* of *Apostolic Constitutions* 8."<sup>53</sup> The Greek word *hierateuein* is here translated as "minister as priest" as this is the term used in the ordination prayer of the ministry of the bishop, though Botte, apparently with an idea of the universal royal priesthood, renders with a plural. The translation offered here is provided on the understanding that this prayer is that of the bishop, newly ordained to the high priesthood.<sup>54</sup> Ratcliff disputes the appearance of the word *hierateuein*, preferring language from the presbyteral ordination prayer.<sup>55</sup> Although he does not state it here, we can assume that his suspicion of the term was aroused by his conviction that the ordination prayer was not original, and as his theory has been shown above to be wanting, we can maintain the translation offered here, and maintain the close relationship of this prayer to the preceding episcopal ordination.

12: The language here is terse to the point of being incomprehensible. The following are problematic:

First, no object is supplied for the verb "gathering." It could be a reference to the elements (which would be strange),<sup>56</sup> to the church or to those who receive (which is possible, but difficult given that it is usual for an adverb to come after the noun to which it refers, rather than preceding it).<sup>57</sup> A further possible explanation for the form is that the Greek read a passive ("being gathered") which the translator either translated with an active ("gathering") because of the absence of a present passive participle in Latin, or perhaps because it was misread as a middle (which would be active in meaning but indistinguishable in form from the passive). In either event, if the emendation proposed in the comment below is correct the absence of any object is much easier to explain, as the verb has direct reference back to the presbytery (which might reasonably be gathered) rather than the offering (which might not).

Second, the phrase translated "saints" (literally, "holy people") might be "holy things." If this is the case, then the phrase should be rendered: "May you grant to all who partake of holy things . . ." The two words are identical in Latin (*sanctis*), but would not be in Greek. Cuming therefore suggests that the compiler of *Apostolic Constitutions*, who expands the phrase into an objective epiklesis, would not have so misunderstood the phrase were people clearly meant, and that therefore "holy things" must have stood at this point.<sup>58</sup> However, one has to ask whether the importance in

fifth century Syria of supplying an objective epiklesis in what was an adaptation rather than a translation, might not outweigh considerations of fidelity to the text of *Apostolic Tradition*.

Third, the verb, "grant," has no clear object or complement. Botte therefore supplies an additional verb,<sup>59</sup> whereas Richardson, reading "holy people," takes all that follows as subordinate and relates the verb to the final clause of the prayer.<sup>60</sup> The resultant translations are as follow:

Botte:

Gathering them into one, grant to all who partake in the holy mysteries to partake to be filled with the Holy Spirit, for the confirmation of their faith

...

Richardson:

Gathering us into one, grant to all us saints, who communicate with a view to being filled with the Holy Spirit and having our faith confirmed in the truth, that we may praise and glorify thee . . .

For completeness we might add Cuming's translation, which is close to that of Botte:

Cuming:

And we ask that you would send your holy Spirit upon the offering of your holy Church that, gathering them into one, you would grant to all who partake of the holy things to partake for the fullness of the Holy Spirit for the strengthening of faith in truth.<sup>61</sup>

Both translations have their weaknesses. Botte has to supply an extra verb, and Richardson alleges that the explanation offered by Botte for the omission of this verb, namely that this is brachyology, is weak.<sup>62</sup> The weakness in Richardson's own proposal is that the clause "that we may praise and glorify . . ." is a long way from the verb "grant," which governs it, and its separation by two subordinate clauses creates a very unnatural construction. It is hard to see why anyone might write this, but we shall attempt to account for the strange construction in the comment below by attributing it to the operation of a redactor.

13: The Latin again expands the doxology. See the comment on 3.6 above.

#### COMMENT

3: Connolly quotes Cyprian, *On the Lord's Prayer*, 31, and Hermas, *Vision*, 3.10.9, and *Mandate*, 10.1.6, to illustrate the idea of lifting hearts to the Lord,<sup>63</sup> though Bouman is not sure of the liturgical context of Hermas'

usage.<sup>64</sup> Connolly also cites *Commentary on Daniel*, 3.4 for the linking of the two adjectives "fitting and right," though here he admits that there is no liturgical context.<sup>65</sup> If this phrase were already part of the liturgy it is quite possible that its appearance in *Commentary on Daniel* comes about because it is known as a liturgical formula, and cannot be used as evidence for assigning the paragraph to <sup>RCN</sup>,<sup>66</sup>

4: On this passage Connolly comments: "with the whole passage compare Hippolytus *Contra Noetum* 17: The Father is one, with whom the Word is present, through whom he made all things, whom, in the latter days, the Father sent for the salvation of people, and he was present and revealed himself, being man from a virgin and the Holy Spirit . . ." <sup>67</sup>

Although there is nothing specifically Hippolytean in the parallels between this passage and the prayer at this point, the comparison is impressive nonetheless, especially in the light of other more specific parallels. The phrase "angel of your will" takes on particular significance at this point, for, as Connolly points out, although it derives from Isaiah 9:6, the thought that the *logos* is the angel described here, and that he has privileged understanding of the Father's will, occurs twice in *Commentary on Daniel* (at 2.32 and 3.9) and at *Against Noetus* 5.

5: This verse contains a further distinctive mark of the thought of <sup>RCN</sup> in describing the word as "inseparable," as at *Against Noetus* 18. This enunciates a very different understanding from that of <sup>REL</sup>, who is so concerned to oppose a monarchical and monistic view of the godhead that he is virtually ditheist. Jungklaus further cites a parallel from *Commentary on Daniel* 2.30: "God who made all things through the Word."<sup>68</sup>

6: One can do no better here than to quote Connolly, who begins by quoting *Benediction of Jacob*: "He was manifested Son of God, begotten as Son of the virgin. . . ." Here . . . we touch a characteristic thought of Hippolytus. Once, though only once, he asserts in express terms that the pre-incarnate *logos* was not yet perfect Son of God [he quotes here *Against Noetus*, 15] . . . But the same thought is latent in other passages."<sup>69</sup> He goes on to quote further from *Against Noetus* and *On the Antichrist*. Connolly's aim in demonstrating these parallels was to demonstrate the Hippolytean authorship of the anaphora. In the light of Brent's work we can now go further and discern which of the authors of the Hippolytean school authored this part of

the anaphora, namely that it is the work of <sup>R</sup>CN, since <sup>R</sup>CN is the author of all the parallels which are cited.

7: The opening of hands was a gesture of prayer. Botte suggests that the usage here is an allusion to Isaiah 65:2: "I stretched out my hands throughout the day to a contumacious and rebellious people," and that it is a common image of the passion in the third century;<sup>70</sup> he also points out that the extension of hands in crucifixion is observed by Epictetus and Artemidorus.<sup>71</sup> From this he deduces that the image combines with the Johannine idea of the lifting up of the Son of Man to indicate Christ's calling of people to himself. Whereas it is certainly possible that this catena of meaning was conjured up by the phrase, it is not explicitly stated in the text. Both Connolly and Lengeling observe the use of this phrase elsewhere in Hippolytean works to refer to the passion;<sup>72</sup> in this context Lengeling in particular observes the depth of allusion in these citations.<sup>73</sup> Botte's understanding of the phrase is clearly present in the usage of *On the Antichrist* 52, which quotes Isaiah 65:2, and employs the image to signify the Savior's invitation to redemption, though in *Benediction of Jacob* 6 it is used of Christ's taking upon himself sin, and the prophecy that Judah's hands would be on the back of his enemies is interpreted as Christ's triumph over his foes at *Benediction of Isaac* 1b.

An alternative approach to the text is taken by Saxer, who suggests that the central idea behind the image is that of supplication; Saxer points out that in *Commentary on Daniel* prayer is the means by which salvation is brought to Daniel, to Susanna, to the three in the furnace, and that this is the means of salvation and liberation, the very context in which the statement is found in this text.<sup>74</sup> We may thus understand the author as seeing the work of the cross as one of supplication to God on behalf of his people.

Both *On the Antichrist* and *Commentary on Daniel* are works from the hand of the second author of the corpus, <sup>R</sup>CN, and so attribution to a level of redaction does not assist with the interpretation of the phrase. In view of the emphasis on the manifestation of God in Christ in the preceding phrase of the prayer, and on the assumption that this verse derives from the same hand, Botte's understanding is perhaps to be preferred. Further evidence that this passage is from the hand of <sup>R</sup>CN may be found in the parallels cited by Connolly to the fulfilment of the Father's will accomplished by Christ, namely *Commentary on Daniel*, 4.10 and 4.30.

8: The following interpretations have been offered for the interpretation of the phrase "fix a boundary." Connolly, noting that the term is employed to mean the rule of faith in *Refutation* nonetheless reckons that the limit referred to here is a "local boundary or a limit of time" and interprets the phrase therefore as setting a time for the resurrection, with reference to the discussion in *On the Universe* of the boundaries of hell.<sup>75</sup> In this he is followed by Dix, who does not, however, discuss the phrase.<sup>76</sup> Botte, in his translation, suggests "the rule (of faith)" but in his accompanying note wonders whether Connolly's understanding is better.<sup>77</sup> Grove in turn suggests that Botte should not have doubted his own rendition, that the resurrection meant the establishment of a rule of faith, and thus that this is the meaning intended;<sup>78</sup> unfortunately Grove has no reference to the use of the term elsewhere in the Hippolytean corpus. Brent, like Connolly, notes that the corpus employs the term in two ways, to mean the rule of faith or to imply a local boundary, and comments: "here clearly the illumination of the just souls that precedes shows that the *terminus*, or *horos* does not mean here 'ordinance' or 'custom' but the 'limit' or 'boundary' of hell established by Christ's descent there."<sup>79</sup> Brent's intention here is to suggest that this phrase is not from the same writer as chapter 3, who is clearly <sup>R</sup>El, and who uses the phrase to mean the rule of faith. However, if this understanding is accepted in the light of the statements in *On the Universe* adduced by Connolly, it does not prove Brent's point, for *On the Universe* is from the same author in the school. *On the Universe* describes Hades in a manner similar to that found in *Refutation* as a place of darkness; but the author explains that whereas the just and unjust alike enter Hades, the just are led from there to a place of light where they await the final resurrection. This is in keeping with the language of the prayer here which states that the just are illuminated, and that Christ manifested the resurrection. On the basis of the Ethiopic version which states "lead forth the saints" and the *Testamentum Domini* which states "guide the just to light" Connolly persuasively suggests that the Greek was not *phōtizomai* but *phōtagōgein*, which is the very word employed in *On the Universe*.<sup>80</sup> Christ's manifestation of the resurrection is likewise to be understood in the light of the eschatology of *On the Universe* as a manifestation of the resurrection which in time all the just might enjoy. Thus the understanding of this passage proposed by Connolly and Brent is to be accepted because of its overall conformity with the thought of *On the Universe* but on these grounds, in contrast to Brent, this part of the prayer is to be attributed to <sup>R</sup>El.



9: Because of the close grammatical attachment of this part of the prayer with the preceding clause, this part of the prayer is to be seen as part of the same redactional level. Its scriptural basis is obvious, though, as Connolly observes, "the formula as a whole follows no single account of the institution."<sup>81</sup>

It is, however, puzzling that both *Testamentum Domini* and the eucharistic prayer in *Apostolic Constitutions* 8 have versions of the institution which are close enough to appear to have derived from a common archetype, but an archetype which cannot be that which appears in the final version of *Apostolic Tradition*.

#### *Apostolic Constitutions*

Taking bread . . . and looking up to you he gave to the disciples saying: take of it, eat. This is my body which is broken for many for the remission of sins. Likewise also the cup, mixing it . . . he gave to them saying

#### *Testamentum Domini*

Taking bread he gave to his disciples saying: take eat, this is my body which is broken for you, for the remission of sins. When you do this you make my memorial.<sup>82</sup> Likewise the cup . . . which he mixed, he gave for a type

#### *Apostolic Tradition*

Taking bread and giving thanks to you, he said: take, eat, this is my body which will be broken for you. Likewise with the cup saying:

This leads Pitt to suggest that the version found in the Latin version of *Apostolic Tradition* is not original, but an expansion of a less complete narrative, independently and separately extended by *Testamentum Domini*, which is shortest and closest to the original.<sup>83</sup> In the light of the similarity which is to be discerned between this prayer and the ordination prayer for a bishop the purpose of the institution narrative may be seen as the provision of an aetiology for the rite, for which a complete narrative would not be necessary, though by the time the translation was made a more complete narrative would be expected. There is thus some merit in Pitt's suggestion. One may also note that in Justin's account of the institution the command to

commemorate is found before the words "This is my body,"<sup>84</sup> just as it is found associated with those same words in *Testamentum Domini*. However, it is odd that the longer narrative now extant should appear not only in the Latin version but in the Ethiopic also. We may therefore suggest an alternative explanation for the phenomena to that of Pitt, namely that both *Apostolic Constitutions* 8 and *Testamentum Domini* depart from the text of *Apostolic Tradition* at this point to follow another source, probably one circulating at that time in Syria. There is certainly sufficient uncertainty concerning the correct solution to the quandary which Pitt observes that it would be irresponsible to print a conjectural reconstruction here.

10: Dix leaves the term translated here as "commemoration" untranslated, because he wishes to avoid any "connotation of any mental or subjective recollection of something in fact absent."<sup>85</sup> Even though Dix goes on to confuse matters by introducing the Jewish Passover into his extended note, and quoting at length from a homily which is not by Hippolytus, the point is nonetheless well made that its meaning is "a recalling before God a fact so that its effects become presently operative."<sup>86</sup>

11: The conformity of the thought expressed here to the language and thought of the preceding ordination prayer means that the paragraph may be assigned safely to <sup>R</sup>El, who was the author of the ordination prayer.

12: Dix argued that the phrase containing the petition to the Holy Spirit should be deleted from this verse. It should be noted that the difficulties with the phrase depend on reading the text as "we ask that you should send your Holy Spirit on the offering of the holy church," which is the version represented by the Latin and Ethiopic versions. Dix proposed this deletion on the grounds that: a) it was incomprehensible, as it is unclear who or what is being joined into one, and the connection with the following petition is unclear; b) it did not fit with Hippolytus' theology of the eucharist, which has no place for the activity of the Holy Spirit; and c) it does not appear in the version of the anaphora in *Testamentum Domini*.<sup>87</sup>

To deal with these objections in reverse order, we should first note that *Testamentum Domini* does retain an invocation of the Holy Spirit, but that it is displaced and separated from the rest of this petition.<sup>88</sup> Second, we should note that the passage which Dix quotes to support his position that Hippolytus has no place for the work of the Spirit in the eucharist is from *In Sanctum Pascha*, a homily which is almost certainly not the work of Hip-

polytus but of an anonymous, and perhaps near-contemporary, Asian.<sup>89</sup> Finally, although, as was noted in the comment on text and translation, the text as it stands is almost incomprehensible, the deletion of this phrase does not really solve any difficulties. We should also note the observation of Richardson that a redactor intent on introducing an epiklesis would have made a better job of it!<sup>90</sup>

A more radical excision was proposed by Ratcliff, who proposed the deletion of the whole paragraph. This would have the merit of joining the thanksgiving that the newly ordained bishop gives for his high-priesthood with the direct offering of praise in the concluding doxology, an idea in complete conformity, we may note, with the sentiments of the ordination prayer. It is also to be noted, with Ratcliff, that the conclusion to the previous paragraph is abrupt, but that it would make more sense were it to dovetail into the final doxology. However, we should again ask why a late interpolator should construct such an obscure epiklesis.

A suggestion which cuts through the nest of issues is that the word "sacrifice" is a scribal error for "presbytery"; if this is the case, then the epiklesis is not an epiklesis at all! The error would have been made before the text came before the Latin translator, for in Greek *prophoran* would not be so different from *presbuterion*, and the error is all the more understandable since a scribe would readily expect a reference to sacrifice here, especially if familiar with the idea of an epiklesis on the gifts, but would not actually be expecting to read the word "presbytery." Such an emendation would result in the translation offered above. The thought is at least comprehensible, even though the syntax in the second part of the clause is strained. The strained syntax may however be the result of interpolation if the paragraph is, as Ratcliff suggested, not original to the prayer. At this point we must turn again to the redactional history of the prayer.

We have assigned the previous paragraph to <sup>R</sup>El. We intend to assign this to <sup>R</sup>CN, who inserted this paragraph into the construction left by <sup>R</sup>El, creating a rather strained grammatical construction. We have already observed that <sup>R</sup>El has only an economic view of the Spirit which he sees being mediated through Jesus and through the church. <sup>R</sup>CN likewise does not have a developed pneumatology, and confuses the Spirit with the *logos*. Both Botte's and Richardson's translations, despite their differences, in seeing the eucharist as the means by which the believer receives the Spirit, might indicate that the thought expressed is close to that of *Against Noetus*,

observing the disjunction between the thought-world of the "preface" and that of the anamnesis/oblation, argued that the same lack of parallel is true of the second part of this anaphora. His solution is to attribute everything from 9 to 12 to interpolation in the fourth century.<sup>95</sup> This fails to explain the purpose of such interpolation or to provide a convincing redactional history. The greatest failure of both attempts is, however, that neither observe the parallels between the anaphora and the thought and writing of the authors of the Hippolytean school. The redactional history offered here, whilst of necessity hypothetical, at least may be related to the history of the school within the Roman church and observes the relationship obtaining between this prayer and the ordination prayer which precedes it.

The structure of both prayers is described by Küppers as remembrance followed by epiklesis.<sup>96</sup> The deletion of an epiklesis rather violates that unity, but the unity between the two prayers stands nonetheless, as the anaphora is simply the fulfilment of the petition of the ordination prayer as the bishop stands and offers gifts and makes the commemoration of Christ.

## 5: On the offering of oil

*1If anyone offers oil he (the bishop) shall render thanks in the same manner as for the offering of bread and wine, not saying it word for word, but to the same effect, saying:*

*2O God, sanctify this oil: grant holiness to all who use it and who receive it, and as you anointed kings, priests and prophets, so may it give strength to all who consume it and health to all who use it.*

### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

2: There are two difficulties in the text of this verse. The prayer for holiness represents an emendation of the word *sanitatem* (health) for *sanctitatem* (holiness). This is in line with the suggestions of Dix and Botte.<sup>97</sup> The word "use" is as appears in the Latin, though Botte, Dix, Cuming and Tateo all read "are anointed" here, reckoning that the Latin results from a confusion by the translator between the Greek words *chriomenois* (anointed) and *chrōmenoīs* (using).<sup>98</sup> Whereas this reading is supported by the Ethiopic version, that could come from the assumption on the part of the translator that the purpose of the oil is anointing, it is equally possible to read the text as imply-

ing that the oil is to be eaten, and therefore to retain the Latin text.<sup>99</sup> The reference to the anointing of kings, priests and prophets does not necessitate its use in anointing, though it is slightly odd, and therefore does not necessitate an emendation of the text. For an explanation of this oddity, see the comment below.

#### COMMENT

1-2: The translation offered above is offered on the assumption that the purpose of the oil is as a comestible. For this reason it is found in between an offering of bread and wine and an offering of cheese and olives. It is slightly odd that the prayer should have reference to the anointing of kings, priests and prophets if the oil is to be consumed, but the oddity is not much less than that which would result were the purpose of the oil the anointing of the sick, for the anointing of the sick, whilst an anointing, is hardly comparable to that of kings, prophets and priests. The appearance of the blessing between two offerings of foodstuffs is moreover a strange place for a prayer consecrating oil for anointing of whatever character.

The preceding rubric is, moreover, odd, in that whereas it directs that the prayer over the oil is to be a thanksgiving similar to that over the bread and wine, the prayer which follows bears no resemblance to the prayer of offering which preceded it. While it is possible that the prayer here was intended as some kind of embolism in a wider thanksgiving, in much the same way that the mediaeval Latin sacramentaries include the blessing of oils in the canon of the mass,<sup>100</sup> that is not what the rubric actually states; the conclusion of chapter 6 states that the doxology which appears at the end of the offering of bread and wine is to be used at every blessing, which is further indication that these offerings are freestanding, rather than intended to be incorporated into the offering of bread and wine,<sup>101</sup> though it might follow on directly from that offering. The symbolism of the Old Testament anointings is found extensively in other liturgical material, as Segelberg points out, but the context is generally baptismal.<sup>102</sup> The suggestion is therefore tentatively put forward here that the prayer as it stands is an adaptation of a prayer in use elsewhere for the consecration of baptismal oils, which has been inserted at this point by <sup>R</sup>CN (on the assumption that the original rubric, together with the prayer over the gifts and the ordination rites, derives from <sup>R</sup>El). Although it is hard to discern a reason for such an insertion, at a purely literary level this is the simplest solution to the problem. Although it is possible that traditional material was simply employed

because it was traditional, even though it fitted ill to the context, it is also possible that this is part of the agendum of <sup>R</sup>CN, namely the incorporation of the bishop into the presbyterium. Thus *Commentary on Daniel*, a work of <sup>R</sup>CN, sees a similarity between the anointing of Moses and that of the Kings and priests of the Old Testament.<sup>103</sup> This prayer thus extends the Mosaic typology found in the ordination prayer at chapter 7 below, which, we shall argue, is the work of <sup>R</sup>CN, to the episcopal ordination.

6:

*1 In the same way, if anyone offers cheese and olives, let him say thus:*

*2 Sanctify this milk which is congealed, and congeal us with your love.*

*3 Let this fruit of the olive, which is an example of your richness, not depart from your sweetness, which you poured out from the tree into the life of those who hope in you.*

*4 However, in every blessing shall be said: To you be glory, to the Father and to the Son with the Holy Spirit in the holy church both now and for ever and into all the ages of the ages.*

#### COMMENT

1: If the prayer in chapter five above is an insertion, the prayers in chapter six are by the same token the product of the same level of redaction. The whole original direction might have read:

If anyone offers oil he shall render thanks in the same manner as for the offering of bread and wine, not saying it word for word, but to the same effect: in the same way if anyone offers cheese and olives.

We shall observe below the possibility that verse 4 belongs to this level of redaction.

2: Hanssens notes the similarity of this rite to that of the artotyrites, who used cheese (perhaps yoghurt) alongside bread at the eucharist. We hear of

the artotyrites from a number of later heresiologists, who consider them a sub-sect of Montanism, or occasionally as Marcionites.<sup>104</sup> However, Hanssens goes on to suggest that there is a distinction between these Montanist artotyrites and the practice described in *Apostolic Tradition*, in that for "Hippolytus" this is an optional rite whereas among the artotyrites bread and cheese constituted the normative eucharist.<sup>105</sup> We cannot however rely to such a great extent on the detail of these later accounts. Cuming likewise denies any connection since "it is most unlikely that Hippolytus would countenance any practice associated with Montanism."<sup>106</sup> However, although the artotyrites of whom Epiphanius informs us are Montanists, it is quite possible that, far from this being a uniquely Montanist practice, it was a common Asian practice in the second century and for this reason is not noted as in any way peculiar by contemporary opponents of Montanism. However, by the fifth century the custom is preserved by Montanists alone, and at that point it appears unusual to Epiphanius and the other heresiologists. The offering of cheese is therefore found in Hippolytus' work because of its normal place in a sacral meal of Asian Christians.<sup>107</sup>

The concern for the unity of the church shows the same thought as that behind the so-called epiklesis (better called a petition) in the offering of bread and wine, which may be an indication that both belong to the same level of redaction, namely <sup>R</sup>CN, who seeks unity among the Roman churches.

3: Connolly observes the similarity between this phrase and the description of the pouring forth of the blood and water from the side of Christ in *Against Noetus* 18.<sup>108</sup> This is further evidence of the redactional level to which this prayer is to be assigned. It is, moreover, possible that <sup>R</sup>CN was reworking traditional material in his construction of this prayer.<sup>109</sup>

4: This final rubric concerning the blessing is held to be secondary by McGowan.<sup>110</sup> There are grounds for this, as the directions before the prayers speak of offering, but this speaks of blessing, which is perhaps a more appropriate characterization of the prayers. Lanne notes that there is no confusion between the blessings of oil, cheese and olives here and the eucharist, whose proper foods are bread and wine.<sup>111</sup> Certainly there is a clear distinction between the different kinds of offering in the text as it now stands, but it would also seem that at an earlier stage there was no distinction between the various offerings, and that a later redactor has introduced such

a distinction. However, if the reconstruction of the earlier rubric and attribution of the following prayers to <sup>R</sup>CN is correct, then this instruction would follow on neatly from the direction that the prayers need not follow the earlier prayer verbatim. Thus the original work of <sup>R</sup>El would have read:

If anyone offers oil he shall render thanks in the same manner as for the offering of bread and wine, not saying it word for word, but to the same effect: in the same way if anyone offers cheese and olives. However, in every blessing shall be said: To you be glory, to the Father and to the Son with the Holy Spirit in the holy church both now and for ever and into all the ages of the ages.

It is therefore more probable that this rubric is not a secondary afterthought but is the work of <sup>R</sup>El, and only appears to be an afterthought because of the interpolation of material in-between it and the preceding instruction. If that is the case, then the blessing which is referred to was not the blessing of food as such, but the concluding doxology, a kind of *hatima* to a Christian *berakah*, which could even have been said congregationally (and would therefore need a fixed form). Once it has been edited through the introduction of additional material separating the rubrics from one another, the term "blessing" is open to re-interpretation as a blessing of food, distinguishable from eucharistic offering in a manner contrary to the original redactor's intention.

Thus the second explanation of the rubric, namely that it originally referred to a common doxology, and has only secondarily come to indicate a distinction between the blessing of foods and the "eucharistizing" of other foods, is preferred.

None of the eight doxologies to be found in *Apostolic Tradition* is quite the same, and additionally a number give problems in textual transmission. However, broadly speaking there are two types, one of which offers praise to the Father through the Son and with the Holy Spirit, the other of which offers praise directly to the Father and the Son, as does the doxology here. The mediatory formula is certainly primitive, but a doxology of the second type appears at the conclusion of *Against Noetus*. In that light its appearance here might indicate that the first explanation of this rubric is to be preferred, since it is a doxology employed by <sup>R</sup>CN. However, a similar doxology appears at 21.21, which is almost certainly to be assigned to <sup>R</sup>El. Jungmann suggests that this is the preferred doxology in the school, but that the author



used the mediatory formula when the concluding statement of the prayer was christological.<sup>112</sup> He does not recognize a distinction between the redactors, but it remains possible to follow him nonetheless, since the doxology ascribing praise in equal parts to the Father and the Son is perhaps closer in spirit to the theology of <sup>R</sup>El; its use by <sup>R</sup>CN can be explained through its having become a common liturgical formula within the school.

**Chapters 5–6:** We have argued that these chapters, fundamentally the work of <sup>R</sup>El, have been interpolated by <sup>R</sup>CN through the addition of prayers. This has been argued not on literary criteria alone, but because each prayer exhibits some aspect of this redactor's agenda. Beyond their content however, the very inclusion of such prayers might derive from the rapprochement with the wider Roman church, for although cheese and oil are known as eucharistic gifts outside Rome, with the exception of these texts no Roman text betrays such a knowledge.

#### DETACHED COMMENT: OFFERING

It is to be noted that the function of the bishop is primarily that of offering gifts, and that people are said here to offer oil, cheese and olives. Subsequently in *Apostolic Tradition* there are other references to offering; there is a discussion of which flowers might be offered, and the candidates for baptism are said to bring offerings on the occasion of their baptism. Since the eucharist was, as will be noted constantly throughout this commentary, a meal, it was necessary that food be supplied. As Easton notes, this entailed a real expense, and might thus be held to be an offering to the church.<sup>113</sup> We should beware however of making this usage the sole origin of the practice and doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice.

#### 7 (Dix 8<sup>114</sup>): On presbyters

<sup>1</sup>*When a presbyter is ordained the bishop will lay a hand upon his head, the presbyters likewise touching him, and he shall speak as we said above, as we said before concerning the bishop, praying and saying:*

<sup>2</sup>*God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, look upon this your servant and impart the Spirit of grace and counsel of presbyterate so that he*

might assist and guide your people with a pure heart, <sup>3</sup>as you looked upon the people of your choice and directed Moses to choose presbyters whom you filled with your spirit which you gave to your servant. <sup>4</sup>And now Lord, grant that the Spirit of your grace may be preserved unceasingly in us, filling us and making us worthy to minister to you in simplicity of heart, praising you <sup>5</sup>through your child Jesus Christ, through whom be glory and might to you, with the Holy Spirit in the holy church both now, and to the ages of the ages. Amen.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

2: There are two textual problems in the Latin version. The word translated "assist" follows the manuscript, though Hauler corrected it to a word meaning "command."<sup>115</sup> Botte nonetheless reads the word as "assist" in line with the versions.<sup>116</sup> This is the better reading. The reference would then be to the social support still offered to the community by the presbyters. In line with the idea that there is a shift in the function of presbyters away from governance the following word, *gubernet*, which might mean "govern," and which is so translated by Dix and Cuming,<sup>117</sup> is translated with "guide," which the Latin word is equally capable of intending. As Brent correctly notes, the terms employed in this prayer refer to pastoral guidance and to teaching.<sup>118</sup> Finally there is a problem with the case ending on the word translated "presbyterate," again deriving from a misreading by Hauler.<sup>119</sup> Were his reading accepted, the prayer would read: "impart the spirit of grace and counsel, that he might command the presbyters . . ." which would make little sense; if the word "command" were read as "assist" but the form of "presbyters" found in the manuscript left intact,<sup>120</sup> it would do violence to the grammar and add little to the sense. The text on which the translation is based is therefore best both on textual and on contextual grounds.

4: Latin reads: "... grant that the spirit of your grace may be preserved unceasingly in us, making us who believe in you worthy to minister . . ." Botte persuasively suggests that the Latin translator misread *plēsthentes* (being filled) as *peīsthentes* (believing).<sup>121</sup> This gains support from the versions.

5: The Latin version again expands the doxology. See the comment on 3.6.

#### COMMENT

1: This rubric is extremely problematic because the text then goes on to give an entirely separate ordination prayer. This was first noticed by Turner, who

suggested that the intention of the rubric was that the prayer should be used as far as the description of the function only,<sup>122</sup> a solution followed by Dix and Powell.<sup>123</sup> But as Walls comments "it involves no small subtlety of thought on the users of Hippolytus' manual."<sup>124</sup> A simpler solution is proposed by Botte, who suggests that given the liberty allowed to the bishop in the composition of prayers a second exemplar might well be allowable at this point;<sup>125</sup> however this does not explain how the different theologies of episcopate which would be implied, were the two prayers to be used interchangeably, might be reconciled. Yet another approach is that of Brent, who does not attempt to solve the problem of the contradictory rubrics but simply allows that two strands co-exist within the single document, which being a community product produced over a number of years is allowed to stand complete with its internal tensions and contradictions. The two strands, with their different understandings of ministry, he sees as <sup>R</sup>El, whose hand is apparent in chapter 3, albeit overlaid at a later date with episcopacy (here he follows Bradshaw and Ratcliff, erroneously and unnecessarily) and <sup>R</sup>CN, who produced the prayer which follows this rubric. He shows that the particular themes of the two prayers, the hieratic theme of the first and the interrelationship between presbytery and bishop implied by the second, are in keeping with the theological emphases of his two main authors.<sup>126</sup> Whereas we may value the insights which he has into the nature of the prayers, and may accept his identification of the two redactional strands, this does not explain the existence of this puzzling rubric.

A historical attempt to explain the tensions is made by Bradshaw when he suggests that this rubric is only referred secondarily to the prayer,<sup>127</sup> and that it had formerly referred to the activity of handlaying, a direction which then becomes incomprehensible when presbyters no longer participate in the ordination of a bishop. If the text referred to activity this would make sense, but the text refers to the prayer being said. Bradshaw might argue that since, in his view, the prayer at chapter 3 is late, the rubric referring to activity preceded it, but this cannot explain how the rubric comes to have its present incomprehensible shape. Bradshaw's suggestion would mean that an incomprehensible rubric referring to a handlaying which no longer takes place would be replaced by an equally incomprehensible rubric referring to a prayer which is not employed in the ordination of a presbyter. It is more reasonable to assume, as explained in the introduction, that tensions and inconsistencies result from a conservative attitude towards the existing text

when additions are made rather than from free emendation, especially when the free emendation which Bradshaw's hypothesis would require results in an inexplicable direction. The problem is that Bradshaw is operating on the assumption that since presbyteral order preceded episcopal order, the presbyteral ordination prayer must therefore be prior. This results from a failure to recognize that a bishop need not be a *monepiscopus*, or that the presbyterate might evolve from being a position of honor to an order of ministry.

Thus we suggest a different literary history which explains the inconsistency better and is in accordance with the history of the Hippolytean community. Namely that the ordination prayer which follows this rubric and which, as we have already noted, is the product of <sup>R</sup>CN, is the interpolation, and that it is interpolated during the development of *Apostolic Tradition* in the third century, whereas this rubric is the work of <sup>R</sup>El, and referred back to the earlier ordination prayer.

In order to sustain the argument it must first be accepted that the ordination prayer at chapter 3 was originally a prayer for the ordination of a leading presbyter, who, like other leading presbyters, was known as an *episkopos*. This *episkopos* was not, however, a *monepiscopus* but a bishop, or presbyter-bishop, among others in the city. As evidence for this we may first note that there is no certain mention of the work of ordination among the functions of the bishop mentioned within the prayer, since this was not something that a presbyter would undertake single-handedly. Thus we may agree with Lécuyer that the typology of the sharing of the spirit of Moses with the elders in the presbyteral prayer at *Apostolic Tradition* 7 implies a theology according to which the episcopate is the source of the sacerdotal spirit,<sup>128</sup> but may note that there is nothing corresponding to this theology in the ordination prayer for a bishop at *Apostolic Tradition* 3. This inconsistency is a sign of the greater antiquity of the prayer at chapter 3, and the more developed understanding of episcopate represented by the prayer at chapter 7. We can understand this rubric, stating that a presbyter is to be ordained by the bishop using the same prayer as that by which he was himself ordained, in the light of seeing the ordination prayer at chapter 3 as that of a leading presbyter: that prayer is fundamentally a presbyteral ordination prayer and might therefore be used at the ordination of any presbyter, not just that of a presbyter-bishop. At the same time this rubric might be added, since for the first time the two are distinguished, albeit not carefully; signif-

icantly the nature of the distinction between bishop and presbyter is implied in that the bishop is necessary for the ordination of a presbyter. Nonetheless the fact that the same prayer might serve for both is an indication that the *episkopos* is still a presbyter-bishop. However, the final establishment of the monepiscopate at the time of Pontianus means not only that there is a change in the role of the bishop, but also that there is a change in the role of the presbyter, since finally there is a breach between the roles of leadership and patronage in the triumph of the teacher. As a result the bishop needs to share his teaching functions with the presbyters, whose role now adjusts from governance to teaching. This is the theology and function which is expressed in the Mosaic typology of the ordination prayer which follows this rubric. In expressing a new theology for a new situation within the Hippolytean community it nonetheless creates a tension because of the continued existence of this rubric, which previously had referred to ordination to a governing presbyterate.

The solution to the literary riddle posed by this rubric is similar to that proposed by Bartlett, who likewise sees that the ordination prayer for a presbyter is the latest element in the complex of ordination prayers and rubrics.<sup>129</sup> It differs in that Bartlett refers to the presbyteral ordination prayer as an interpolation, the date of which he is unsure. However, this would imply that it derived from outside the Hippolytean school, whereas to correlate the provision of the prayer to the history of the Hippolytean community as reconstructed by Brent, and noting in particular the manner in which the prayers provided cohere with the theological emphases of the two main authors of the Hippolytean corpus, enables us to propose this solution as not a literary solution only but also as historically grounded.

3: The reference is to Numbers 11:16–25, where Moses selected seventy elders (*presbuteroi*) to assist him at the command of God, who shared with them the same spirit he had given to Moses. The theology of ministry implicit in this statement is fundamentally presbyteral, which fits in with the perspective of <sup>R</sup>CN. *Against Noetus* 1 states that the succession of teaching and tradition is handed down by “presbyters of blessed memory,” whereas Noetus was condemned by the blessed presbyters.<sup>130</sup>

## 8 (Dix 9): On deacons

*1And when a deacon is installed let him be chosen in accordance with those things which were said above, in the same way the bishop alone laying hands. Just so we prescribe that at the ordination of a deacon the bishop alone lays hands, 2for the reason that he is not ordained to priesthood, but to serve the bishop, that he might do those things which are commanded by him. 3For he is not a participant in the council of the clergy but looks after and indicates to the bishop what is necessary, 4not receiving the spirit of the presbytery which the presbyters share, but that which is entrusted him under the power of the bishop. 5For which reason the bishop alone shall ordain a deacon; 6on a presbyter however the presbyters also lay their hands because of the common and like spirit of their order. 7For the presbyter has authority in this matter only, that he may receive; he does not, however, have the authority to give. 8Therefore he does not appoint clergy; at the ordination of a presbyter he seals, as the bishop lays hands.*

*9Over a deacon, therefore, let him say thus:*

*10God who created all things and ordered them by your Word, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom you sent to serve your will and to show us your desire, 11grant the Holy Spirit of grace and sincerity and diligence on this your servant, whom you have chosen to serve your church and to present in your holy of holies that which is offered to you by your appointed high-priest to the glory of your name that serving blamelessly and in purity he may be worthy of the rank of his exalted order and praise you 12through your child Jesus Christ, through whom be glory and power and praise to you, with the Holy Spirit in the holy church, now and always and to the ages of the ages. Amen*

## TEXT AND TRANSLATION

11: There are difficulties in this text resulting from divergence between the versions as well as difficulties within the Latin text.

The verb translated "installed" might be translated even more literally as

"seated." The Latin has "ordained" but the original Greek word is retained by the Coptic version.

The verb translated "prescribe" appears in the present text in the manuscript, but the first editor, Hauler, emended it to a perfect and punctuated thus:

And when a deacon is appointed let him be chosen in accordance with those things which were said above, in the same way the bishop alone laying hands, just as we prescribed. At the ordination of a deacon the bishop alone lays hands . . .

Dix punctuates as in the translation above, Botte and Cuming in accordance with Hauler's emendation and punctuation.<sup>131</sup>

2: The phrase translated "commanded by him" appears as "commanded of him" (i.e. the deacon) in the Sahidic. Although the Greek forms would have been different they would be close enough to cause confusion. Either translation is possible on the basis of sense.

4: "Spirit of the presbytery," the text favored by Dix and Botte,<sup>132</sup> might be "spirit of seniority," the text and interpretation favored here by Cuming.<sup>133</sup> If, however, this is the work of <sup>B</sup>CN, as will be argued below, then we should expect a move away from the concept of seniority marking out the presbyter's office which, as Powell in particular argued, was the defining mark of the presbyterate,<sup>134</sup> to a cadre of teachers, functioning in communion with the Bishop's teaching. If the deacon was the *oikonomos* of the household, as we argue in the comment below, then the deacon would have no preparation for and no role in teaching. The oriental versions all expand this statement in different ways, but there is no basis on which to determine the original text.

5: "Ordain" is translated following the Sahidic version, which seems to preserve the Greek. The Latin version has "make."

6: The oriental versions differ drastically from the Latin in this and the following two verses. Dix suggests that this is because the eastern translators did not know of the custom of presbyters laying hands alongside bishops at presbyteral ordinations and were therefore confused.<sup>135</sup> Cuming here has "the presbyters *alone* shall lay their hands" (my italics). We can only assume that this is a typographical error.

8: The words "appoint" and "lays hands" are taken again from the Sahidic version rather than the Latin.

"Seals" is rendered by Dix as "blesses." "Seals" seems to indicate that the presbyters are marking out their choice, which is an indication that the rite is a survival of election of presbyters by the presbytery.

11: The Latin version breaks off in the middle of this verse, after "present." The rest of the prayer is supplied by a combination of the Ethiopic version, *Testamentum Domini*

and (in the doxology) some conjectural reconstruction, though principally *Testamentum Domini*. Dix likewise follows this version here,<sup>136</sup> whereas Botte and Cumming employ the Ethiopic version.<sup>137</sup> The reason for preferring the Syriac here is stated in the comment.

12: Although based on the Ethiopic version, this is a conjectural reconstruction, omitting the words "Our Lord" and adding the words "in the holy church," on both occasions following the suggestion of Dix.<sup>138</sup>

#### COMMENT

1: The difficulties in the translation derive in part from the confusion of ideas. The reference to an earlier instruction is, like that found in the introduction to the ordination of a bishop, probably a reference to the earlier treatment of charismata. The author however feels the need to repeat the prescription and goes on to justify it.

The appearance of a reference to seating is curious. Ordination by seating was known both in early Judaism and in early Christianity, though in Christianity it is known only of bishops.<sup>139</sup> Dix, who follows the Coptic at this point, suggests that this refers only to election,<sup>140</sup> but ordination might nonetheless be intended, if only because it does not appear that the deacon was actually elected, unless the reference to "what was said above" is to the episcopal ordination.<sup>141</sup> This is problematic because it makes nonsense of the reference in the episcopal ordination rite to a preceding instruction. The reference to a preceding procedure at the presbyteral ordination rite makes explicit reference to the episcopal ordination rite.

2: This paragraph is the work of <sup>R</sup>El, since the language of priesthood characteristic of this redactor is employed. We note below that the <sup>R</sup>CN feels the need to elaborate further on the limitation of the deacon's role, though in that case it has to do with the preservation of the prerogatives of the presbyters, whereas in this verse the issue is that of the bishop. The likelihood is that the basic groundwork of this section was laid by <sup>R</sup>El, but that <sup>R</sup>CN has expanded it to meet the needs of the changed situation, as will be argued in greater detail below.

One should, however, pause to enquire why the writer felt the need to emphasize that the deacon did not share in the bishop's priesthood. Otterbein suggests that "the special emphasis which the Church Orders place on this point seems to indicate that some deacons had presumed to usurp for



themselves some of the duties and functions of the presbyterate.<sup>142</sup> Otterbein seems to think that these are sacramental functions, but the deacon is found exercising sacramental functions at chapter 24, and is allowed by <sup>R</sup>CN at chapter 28 to bless a meal in the absence of a presbyter. The more probable issue is that which is confronted in the verse below, namely whether a deacon is a member of the ruling presbyterate, as Powell argues that he always was.<sup>143</sup> Powell presents evidence for diaconate being considered a function within a group collectively known as presbyters, but we should beware of turning this into a universal phenomenon. *Diakonia* is a general and unspecific word for ministry in Greek, and so anyone exercising ministry might be referred to as a deacon. However the specific duties which are described here, namely that of personal attendance on the bishop and the responsibility for receiving and preparing the offering point to the origin of the deacon known in this community at least as being the *oikonomos* of the household. The *oikonomos* in a large Graeco-Roman household had responsibility and oversight of the daily management of the household, for the supply of food and the payment of expenses. As such, whether a slave or a freedman, he was in a position to exercise significant power within the household, and would of necessity be under the direct command of the householder. Interestingly Epictetus comments that nobody would make himself *oikonomos*, because this is an appointment of the master alone.<sup>144</sup> As the bishop takes command of the household, so he takes command of the appointment of its *oikonomos*. In the same passage Epictetus also refers to the *oikonomos* as a *huperētēs*. This is significant because *huperētai* are known from the synagogues, where they performed an assisting role. Synagogues moreover, were, like the Hippolytean household-school-church, domestic institutions with religious and academic functions. Thus Ignatius states that the deacon is the *huperētēs* of the church.<sup>145</sup>

But the *oikonomos*/deacon would not have been a patron, and would not therefore have filled the role envisaged for presbyters in the early history of the Hippolytean community. Whilst close to the bishop he did not have absolute oversight. In other contexts, however, the *oikonomos* might have such oversight and patronage. For apart from households, cities would have an *oikonomos*, and in this context the *oikonomos* would of necessity have a *leitourgia* (a public duty) and would be a member of the patronal classes. Interestingly part of this *leitourgia* was the provision of goods for sacrifice and, although they would not undertake the sacrifices themselves they

would play a role in its distribution.<sup>146</sup> Religious cults and societies quite apart from Christianity also might have *oikonomoi*, though it is not clear whether they might also act as patrons of the cult, since in many cases they might also be civic officials.<sup>147</sup> The probability is that in some Christian households the *oikonomos* might also be a patron but Hippolytus (or rather <sup>R</sup>El) is making it clear that in this community the *oikonomos* is subservient to the bishop. <sup>R</sup>CN subsequently makes it plain that the *oikonomos* is not a member of the cadre of teachers either.

4: Jungklaus points out the divergence here from the older Roman understanding, to which *I Clement* 40 bears witness, of the virtual equation of presbyters and deacons.<sup>148</sup> This results from the vast changes that came about through the unification of the Roman congregations.

8: By contrast to presbyters, the bishop, according to the ordination prayer of chapter 3, does assign lots; this responsibility is being taken over from the presbyters.

3–9: The text here seems rambling and confused. This points to extensive redactional activity. It has already been suggested that verse 2 is the work of <sup>R</sup>El. Verses 4, and probably 3, are the work of <sup>R</sup>CN, with the insistence on the common spirit of the presbyterate which marks the presbyteral ordination prayer. If these are deleted then verse 5 follows on naturally from verse 2. Verse 6 is once again imbued with the presbyteral spirit of *Against Noetus*, and should be assigned to <sup>R</sup>CN. Easton thinks that verses 7 and 8 are a gloss because he cannot see how, if the presbyter has no power to give, it is reasonable to speak of the shared spirit of the presbyters.<sup>149</sup> But if the statement is read in the light of the ordination prayer at chapter 7 there is no contradiction. It is, however, hard to see why <sup>R</sup>CN should wish to include this statement, even though it is not a sentiment with which he would necessarily disagree. It is therefore to be assigned to <sup>R</sup>El, and read as denying any claim by presbyters of the right to appoint deacons as, no doubt, the governing patron-presbyters had formerly done; even if not actually a householder, the bishop is now acting as such and therefore appoints his own *oikonomos* over the heads of the householders. In this case verse 8 may be seen as a gloss by <sup>R</sup>CN on the former verse. Verse 9 can then be attributed to <sup>R</sup>El. Stripped of the redactional activity of <sup>R</sup>CN, and with the understanding of verse 7 proposed here, the instructions make perfectly reasonable sense. They read:

And when a deacon is appointed let him be chosen in accordance with those things which were said above, in the same way the bishop alone laying hands. Just so we prescribe that at the ordination of a deacon the bishop alone lays hands, for the reason that he is not ordained to priesthood, but to serve the bishop, that he might do those things which are commanded by him. For which reason the bishop alone shall ordain a deacon. For the presbyter has authority in this matter only, that he may receive; he does not, however, have the authority to give. Therefore he does not appoint clergy. Over a deacon, therefore, let him say this:

10: There seems to be a strange duplication of openings here, which leads one to suspect that the same redactional process of expansion observed in the discussion of the diaconate has been extended to the prayer. The first clause implies a two-fold order of creation, of the elements first followed by formation by the Word, which is the doctrine of creation proposed in *Refutation* 10.28–29. *Against Noetus* 10 however denies such a two-fold creative effort. We have already observed that this author, however, emphasizes the extent to which Christ fulfilled and served the will of the Father, and may suggest that the second opening comes from the hand of this author.

11: The description of the deacon's duties is coherent with the statement at the anaphora at the episcopal ordination that the deacons present the oblation to the bishop as with the statement in the post-baptismal eucharist at 21.27 that the deacons should offer the oblation to the bishop.

However, the Ethiopic version of this prayer asks that the candidate obtain a higher office, one manuscript specifying that the higher office is that of priesthood. Easton is rightly suspicious of such a reading.<sup>150</sup> The reading can, moreover be explained, as there is potential for confusion because Ethiopic lacks a true comparative. This would explain the manner in which being worthy of the rank of a high order might become "obtaining the rank of a high(er) order and your honor," a statement which would, in turn, lead to the need to specify such an office.<sup>151</sup> Although it was possible for deacons to be ordained in third century Rome to subsequent orders<sup>152</sup> this was not an automatic or a regular proceeding and it would be strange for this to be built into the prayer.

## 9 (Dix 10): On confessors

*<sup>1</sup>Now if a confessor is in chains for the sake of the name of the Lord, a hand is not laid on him for the diaconate or for presbyterate. For he has the honor of the presbyterate on account of his confession. If he is to be installed as bishop, then is the hand to be laid upon him. <sup>2</sup>If a confessor has not been taken to trial, or has not been punished with chains, or has not been shut up in prison or has not been condemned with any penalty but by chance has been merely abused on account of the name of our Lord and has been punished with domestic punishment, although he bore witness, let the hand be laid on him for whatever orders of which he is deserving.*

*<sup>3</sup>When the Bishop gives thanks in accordance with what was said above it is not absolutely incumbent on him that he recite the identical words which we stated above as though performing a set declamatory exercise! In giving thanks to God let each pray according to his ability. If he has the ability to pray easily in a sophisticated manner then that is good. If someone, when he prays, offers a mean prayer do not seek to prevent him, only he must pray in an orthodox manner.*

## TEXT AND TRANSLATION

1–3: This chapter is rendered from the Sahidic version.

3: On the word translated “sophisticated” (Dix: “grand and elevated”; Cuming: “solemn”)<sup>153</sup> which he renders “solonnelle,” Botte comments: “It is hard to say which Greek word underlies the Coptic; the word evokes the idea of something precious.”<sup>154</sup> “Sophisticated” is chosen here in the light of the earlier reference to sophistic practice (on which see the comment below).

## COMMENT

1–2: That the presbyterate should be considered an honor, but not a profession, is indicative of an early date for this section; the protection of the prerogative of the bishop however indicates that episcopal office is distinguished from presbyteral honor. It is possible that the custom of con-

sidering a confessor to have attained the rank of presbyterate, even though he might not be in a financial position to act as patron, is an ancient custom here being legislated.<sup>155</sup> There is no particular persecution in mind. Callistus, however, was exiled on account of his confession and it is possible that his restitution on return is related to this custom.

It is also significant that a "domestic" punishment does not give the same entitlement. The paragraph can only be referring to the situation of slaves in a pagan household who might be punished within the household for the profession of Christianity. Although the honor of the presbyterate might be extended to those without position who were punished on behalf of Christ, the penalties exacted of slaves might be lesser (because a master would not want to lose a valuable asset). This is in keeping with the conservative attitudes towards the slave-class exhibited by <sup>R</sup>El in *Refutation*, to whom the whole passage is to be attributed. As such this, and the following paragraph, form a conclusion to the original section on office and order.

3: The art of prayer is here compared to the art of declamation. The bishop is not intended to memorize the prayers given above, as sophists, the public speakers of antiquity who were teachers and celebrities, would memorize large sections of set speeches in order to deliver them with the appearance of extemporization, but the extemporization is to be real. Botte compares this to the idea of set written liturgical prayers, but the contrast *Apostolic Tradition* has in mind is not between set prayers and improvisation,<sup>156</sup> for the idea of set prayers does not enter the author's head, but rather between the sophistic ideal of improvisation and the manner in which sophists would cheat by composing in advance and then appearing to extemporize. As further evidence of the practice of extemporization in contemporary liturgical prayer Easton cites Justin Martyr, *First Apology* 67, where the president offers prayer "according to his ability" and Tertullian, *Apology* 30, where Christian prayers are said to be from the heart.<sup>157</sup> More pertinent background however is in the pagan sophistic practice.<sup>158</sup>

This is perhaps the conclusion of this section at <sup>R</sup>El's stage of redaction. What follows seems to be an afterthought. It is probable that it is added by <sup>R</sup>CN to bring *Apostolic Tradition* into conformity with the wider Roman church, though there are no particular agenda apparent which would make such an attribution secure.

11 (Dix 12)<sup>159</sup>: On the reader

*A reader is installed as the bishop hands him a book. He has no laying on of hands.*

## TEXT AND TRANSLATION

The version given above is that in the Greek epitome, followed by Botte and Cuming. The Sahidic version reads:

When the reader is installed the bishop shall hand him the book of the apostle and pray over him; the hand is not laid on him.

## COMMENT

A reader was appointed in the synagogue in the same way. Although a historical connection is possible<sup>160</sup> this cannot be stated with confidence, as appointment by porrection was widespread in the ancient world, including at Rome.<sup>161</sup>

## 13 (Dix 14): On subdeacons

*A hand is not laid on the subdeacon; rather he is named so that he might go after the deacon.*

## COMMENT

Easton suggests that the limitation of the number of deacons in any church to seven (modelled after the seven of Acts 6) meant the creation of the subdiaconate as a separate order of those who would follow the deacons (the underlying Greek word is *akolouthēō*, from which the word "acolyte" is derived); this is probably the word lying behind the Coptic translated very literally as "go after." In time, Easton suggests, even these were insufficient and that this gave rise to the office of acolyte.<sup>162</sup> There is however no reference to Acts 6 in *Apostolic Tradition*, though the limitation of the number of deacons is known in Rome. The creation of the subdiaconate might how-

ever be a result of a restriction in the number of deacons, coming about when the Hippolytean community is joined to the wider Roman church at the time of Pontianus, at which approximate time, as Jungklaus points out, the restriction in the numbers of deacons is first found.<sup>163</sup> This is the redactional stage at which we have already suggested that this section belongs.

### 10 (Dix 11): On widows

*1 When a widow is appointed she does not receive laying on of hands but is chosen by the name. 2 If her husband has been dead a long time let her be appointed. 3 If her husband is recently dead do not believe her. Even if she is elderly she should be tested for a time, for often the passions grow old in one who finds a place for them in himself. 4 Let the widow be installed with the word only and let her join the rest. But a hand shall not be laid on her because she does not lift up the sacrifice nor does she have a proper liturgy. 5 For the laying on of hands is with the clergy on account of the liturgy, whereas the widow is installed on account of prayer, which is for everybody.*

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

1: This is the literal statement of the Sahidic version. It is perhaps the case that the passage originally meant that she chose the name (of widow). This would tend to be supported by verse 3 below as by the Syriac which supplies part of chapter 12 below.

#### COMMENT

3: Roman law, through the *lex Julia et Papia*, encouraged the remarriage of younger widows through economic penalties on those who did not, and economic advantage might in any event accrue to a widow who remarried, especially since a widow, whose husband died intestate, would be left without inheritance. The passions of desire for luxury and wealth, rather than sexual passions, might be the passions against which the community is to guard itself in policing carefully those who wish to join the rank of widows.

4: Whereas it is possible that "liturgy" is being used here in the sense of a public role in the assembly, it is also possible that it is used in its broader and more ancient sense of a public duty performed as an act of patronage. As is clear in the discussion at chapter 30 below of giving food to widows, the widows receive patronage, and do not exercise it.

## 12 (Dix 13): On virgins

*A virgin is not installed by people, nor is appointed; she herself chooses to be separated and takes the name. A hand is not laid on a virgin but her choice alone makes her a virgin.*

### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

The first sentence is supplied from *Testamentum Domini*, slightly adapted by dropping reference to male virgins. This accords with the suggestion of Dix that a sentence had dropped out of this chapter on grounds of apparent repetitiousness, but that something more was required than the Sahidic preserves.<sup>164</sup>

## 14 (Dix 15): On a spiritual gift

*If somebody appears to have received the gift of healing or revelation a hand is not laid on him for the facts of the matter will reveal whether he has spoken the truth.*

### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

The translation above is close to the text of *Testamentum Domini*. The Sahidic version states "If anyone says 'I have received the gift of healing through revelation . . .'" Dix explains the opening difference satisfactorily through positing a misreading of *ean phanē* (such is the text lying behind *Testamentum Domini*) as *ean phē*.<sup>165</sup> Dix however retains the reading of the Sahidic version, supported by *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.26.2, as "through." However, it is possible that this came about through misunderstanding as, at the time the translation was made, prophecy had long died out in the Christian churches whereas, in the third century, although less common than



in the past it is still known. Healing however might be received through revelation and visions received at incubations in the shrines of saints, in which the saint would visit the sick person in a dream or vision and heal them,<sup>166</sup> and so it is possible that the Sahidic translator and the author of *Apostolic Constitutions* 8 alike understood the statement here to be discussing the claim that somebody had received healing, or the means of healing, in or through a vision or revelation.

#### COMMENT

The continued existence of revelations in the community is noteworthy; for although prophecy had to an extent declined in Christianity by the third century,<sup>167</sup> dreams and visions continued to be prized.<sup>168</sup> That the revelation should be tested by its effectiveness is in keeping with the almost universal conviction of early Christians that the spirits should be tested. At the end of the second century and the beginning of the third century Montanism had found its way to Rome, and was highly controversial.<sup>169</sup> El in his homily on the Psalms showed himself to be relatively moderate, negative about Montanism but recognizing the validity of the continuing practice of prophecy nonetheless.

Reliable evidence of the continued practice of healing in the Roman church of the third century is less available, since it did not provoke controversy, though *Excerpts from Theodotus* 24.1 implies that healing and prophecy are no strangers to the church. In time a class of recognized exorcists is found at Rome, but as Cuming notes, this is not the case until half-way through the third century.<sup>169</sup>

Finally we should note that the regulation stating that visionaries and healers should not be ordained shows that bureaucratic legitimation did not supplant charismatic legitimation of leadership<sup>170</sup> but that they were parallel forms of authority and activity.

#### 15 (Dix 16): On newcomers

<sup>1</sup>Those who come to hear the word for the first time should first be brought to the teachers in the house, before the people come in. <sup>2</sup>And they should enquire concerning the reason why they have turned to the

faith. And those who brought them shall bear witness whether they have the ability to hear the word. <sup>3</sup>They might be questioned about their state of life, whether he has a wife, or whether he is a slave. <sup>4</sup>If he is the slave of a believer and his master encourages him, let him hear the word. If his master does not bear witness to him, that he is good, he should be rejected. <sup>5</sup>If his master is a pagan, teach him to please his master, that there should be no scandal. <sup>6</sup>If there is somebody who has a wife, or if a woman has a husband, so should they be taught that the man be contented with his wife and the wife with her husband. <sup>7</sup>If there is somebody who does not live with a wife he should be taught not to fornicate but that he should either take a wife in accordance with the law or should remain (as he is) in accordance with the law. <sup>8</sup>But if there is one who has a demon, let him not hear the word of teaching until he be purified.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

1: This translation is a mixture of the Sahidic version and the *Testamentum Domini*. The Sahidic version begins: "Let those who should be brought in to the new faith..." Although a Greek word is preserved here it is hard to see how the context might fit, and so *Testamentum Domini* (with some support from the *Apostolic Constitutions*) is followed.<sup>171</sup> The words "in the house" are found only in *Testamentum Domini* but are retained here as original following the suggestion of Dix.<sup>172</sup>

3: Sahidic omits the second question, though Botte convincingly explains the omission here through homoioteleuton.<sup>173</sup> *Testamentum Domini* has both questions.<sup>174</sup>

4: The word translated "encourage" might mean "permit." This is the rendition of Jungklaus, Easton, Botte, Cuming, Dix and Tateo,<sup>175</sup> "Encourages" however seems more in line with the context.

7: The second appearance of the phrase "in accordance with the law" is omitted by Jungklaus, Dix, Botte, Cuming and Tateo.<sup>176</sup> Botte suggests that it has resulted from the corruption of the phrase "on his own" which would have a certain similarity in Greek. For the argument for retaining the phrase see the comment below.

#### COMMENT

1: "In the house" is found only in *Testamentum Domini*. Dix retains the words on the grounds that this is in conformity with the domestic setting of

early Christian teachers;<sup>177</sup> Justin's school was based on the household,<sup>178</sup> and Dix suggested that teachers were semi-official, that the bishop was only involved when the catechumens approached baptism. This seems to reflect a rather more centralized episcopate than was known in Rome in the early third century, but his instinct, in seeing the teachers as independent agents in a domestic setting, is certainly sound. Note, however, that there is reference to a church in 18.2 below. That nonetheless may be a church in a domestic setting, like the premises of the teachers. We may observe the absence of rituals like the giving of salt or consignation, which in a later period marked the making of catechumens. This comes about because at the stage of Roman Christianity represented by this chapter, there is no centralization, and there is thus no involvement by the heads of communities (who might be the patrons, separate from the teachers themselves). Jungklaus thinks the teachers are ordained, as they are found here exercising judgment which is said in earlier chapters to be the preserve of the bishops and presbyters,<sup>179</sup> but this results from the redactional activity which has produced *Apostolic Tradition*. This chapter, as will be argued more extensively below, derives from P.

4: A slave might seek to join the Christian cult in order to please a Christian master and so to gain advancement or manumission. Perhaps most notable among slaves of Christian masters is <sup>R</sup>El's bête noir, Callistus!<sup>180</sup> This alone is not, however, sufficient to assign this verse to that level of redaction.

7: The statement that the petitioner is to marry in accordance with the law is puzzling. The phrase found in the Sahidic is Greek, and so is presumably original, and so the assumption must be that the petitioner is free, since slaves could not contract marriages (their unions were recognized *de facto* but not *de iure*). It is however possible that the author means that a marriage is to be contracted according to the law of God. This would explain the second appearance of the phrase.

## 16 (Dix 16 cont.): On trades and professions

<sup>1</sup>*Enquiry should be made concerning the crafts and occupations of those who are brought to be instructed.*

<sup>2</sup>If any is a pimp or procurer of prostitutes he should desist or he should be rejected. <sup>3</sup>If any is a sculptor or a painter he should be instructed not to make idols; he should desist or he should be rejected. <sup>4</sup>If any is an actor, or makes presentations in the theater, he should desist, or he should be rejected. <sup>5</sup>If somebody teaches children it is better that he desist; if he have no other trade let him be allowed. <sup>6</sup>Likewise a charioteer who competes, or anyone who goes to the races, should desist or be rejected. If any is a gladiator, or trains gladiators in fighting, or one who fights with beasts in the games, or a public official engaged in gladiatorial business should desist, or he should be rejected. <sup>7</sup>If any is a priest of idols, or a guardian of idols, he should desist, or he should be rejected. <sup>8</sup>A soldier in command must be told not to kill people; if he is ordered so to do, he shall not carry it out. Nor should he take the oath. If he will not agree, he should be rejected. <sup>9</sup>Anyone who has the power of the sword, or who is a civil magistrate wearing the purple, should desist, or he should be rejected. <sup>10</sup>If a catechumen or a believer wishes to become a soldier they should be rejected, for they have despised God. <sup>11</sup>A prostitute or a wastrel or any who has been castrated, or any who has performed any other unspeakable deed, should be rejected, for they are impure. <sup>12</sup>A magician should not be brought for a decision. A maker of spells or an astrologer or a soothsayer or an interpreter of dreams or a rabble-rouser or somebody who cuts fringes on clothes (that is to say scissor-users) or any who makes amulets, should desist, or they should be rejected. <sup>13</sup>Somebody's concubine, if she is his slave, if she has raised his children and holds to him alone, should hear; otherwise she should be rejected. <sup>14</sup>A man who has a concubine should desist, and take a wife in accordance with the law. If he does not wish to do so he should be rejected. <sup>14b</sup>If a believing woman consort with a slave she should desist, or she should be rejected. <sup>15</sup>If we have omitted any other matter the works will instruct your eyes. For we all have the spirit of God.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

1: Dix notes that there is great confusion among the versions in this list of forbidden trades, since subsequent translators, under changed conditions, did not understand

the list.<sup>181</sup> Dix translates the Sahidic versin, which is the basis of the translation offered here. For "instructed" (*katêcheisthai*) Sahidic reads "installed" (*kathistanai*).

6: The words translated as "public official engaged in gladiatorial business" are not altogether clear, and the translation here is based on a suggestion of Botte.<sup>182</sup>

8: Although the words translated "in command" is the obvious translation of the Sahidic, the context, as Botte points out,<sup>183</sup> would tend to indicate that the soldier in question is under, rather than in, authority. There is however no authority to alter the translation.

11: The words translated "who has castrated himself" reflect the Sahidic. Botte however notes that the Greek word in the corresponding part of *Apostolic Constitutions* is *kinaidos*; a *kinaidos* is the passive partner in a homosexual act between males. There is a connection, as eunuchs were commonly used in this role, and were sold as slaves for the purpose. The following clause concerning unspeakable deeds may also have the same context, for eunuchs were also employed by women for similar purposes.<sup>184</sup>

12: The text is hopelessly corrupt at the point concerning the clipper of fringes on clothes; the Sahidic actually says "stammerers" (*psellistēs*) though Botte proposes an emendation of this word to *psalistēs*.<sup>185</sup> Although this would be the only appearance of such a word, the word *psalidion* is found, meaning an instrument employed for the trimming of coin; a *psalistēs* would thus mean "a coin-trimmer." If a coin-trimmer is intended, that would fit in with the mention of the rabble-rouser, where the sense is that of somebody who gathers a crowd in a market-place, perhaps a street entertainer. Botte is followed by Tateo.<sup>186</sup> Chadwick however suggests that the rabble-rouser is a magician,<sup>187</sup> and that the whole phrase concerns magic and forms of trickery. He therefore interprets the cutter of fringes on clothes as implying that fringes on clothes might be imbued with magical properties. A further possibility, in line with Chadwick's suggestion, is that Jews are intended and that the phrase refers to zizzith; the maker of amulets (the Greek word reflected in the Sahidic is actually "phylacteries") might in that case belong with the cutter of fringes and refer to somebody who does business with Jews.

14b: This phrase is doubtful as it is only found in the Greek Epitome. It is ignored by Jungklaus, Easton, Botte, Tateo and Cuming and printed in italics by Dix.<sup>188</sup> For an argument for its retention see the comment below.

15: Ethiopic (and Arabic) have, for "the works will instruct your eyes," "decide as you think fit." This would seem to be the sense, but the Sahidic is retained here, as the other versions might be resolutions of an obscure phrase in the original.

## COMMENT

2: Jungklaus believes that this is a dig at Callistus from Hippolytus' pen.<sup>189</sup> This seems to be overstating matters, though see verse 14b and the comment below.

3: The phrase "he should be taught not to make idols" is a qualification of a kind not found elsewhere in this list. It is therefore possible that the exception is redactional; the Hippolytean community had occasion to employ a sculptor.

5: The *grammaticus*, or schoolmaster, whose basic duties were firstly the teaching of reading and writing, and subsequently of recitation and basic composition, would of necessity and custom teach through the medium of pagan myths, and subsequently of Homer which would bring him potentially into the sphere of malign influence; the relatively relaxed attitude shown here towards the teacher is indicative of the scholastic orientation of this Christian community.<sup>190</sup> REI, to judge by the *Homily on the Psalms*, an extant work from his pen, which may be found below in the appendix, had at least a basic rhetorical training.<sup>191</sup>

6: Although the majority of gladiators were slaves, prisoners, or otherwise under obligation to fight, in which case the prohibition upon their admission as catechumens might seem somewhat strange, there were volunteers, who were sometimes of high rank. It was moreover possible for a gladiator to survive,<sup>192</sup> since contracts limited the number of fights in which the gladiator should participate, after which, if a slave or prisoner, he would receive freedom.

9: The purple was the purple-fringed toga worn by those in certain positions of civil authority. Easton rightly points out that apart from the obligation to impose capital punishment, magistracies were intimately bound up to the cult of the Emperor and thus tended to exclude any who held them.<sup>193</sup>

10: The person who becomes a soldier despises God because in order to join the army they take the military oath, with its idolatrous content, also outlawed at verse 8 above.<sup>194</sup>

13: The slave-concubine of a free man, effectively his wife but forbidden marriage because of her status as a slave, was a common phenomenon.

Jungklaus points out that, under Roman law, concubinage resulting in the birth of children was given *de facto* recognition as marriage.<sup>195</sup>

14: See the comment on "in accordance with the law" at 15.7 above. In order to marry his concubine, the man would have first to manumit her; even then there would be severe social consequences, and members of the senatorial classes even then could not marry; thus the Emperor Pius is recorded as having a freedwoman concubine.<sup>196</sup> Even were the concubine not a slave it was not uncommon for a widower to live with a concubine, not marrying her in order to not create confusion over estates and inheritance.<sup>197</sup>

14b: Callistus allowed free Christian women to take slave-men as "consorts" even though, under the law, they were not allowed to marry. This raised the ire of <sup>R</sup>El considerably!<sup>198</sup> The prohibition here does not belong with the forbidden occupations since it applies to those who are already baptized, but it is in keeping with <sup>R</sup>El's view of the church. It is therefore possible that the phrase is added by that redactor onto a previously existing list. If this is the case then the chapter, with this exception and the qualification added at verse 2, may be assigned to P.

15: Jungklaus and Dix think that this is an interpolation modelled on 43B.<sup>199</sup> It is hard to see why or how such an interpolation might enter here. Since <sup>R</sup>El holds that the Spirit is given only to the orthodox this could well be retained from P, the corresponding phrases at 43B being reworkings of P.

## 17: On the time during which they shall hear the word after crafts and professions

*1Catechumens should hear the word for three years. 2But if a man is keen and perseveres well in the matter, the length of time should not be considered but his manner alone should be considered.*

### COMMENT

As noted in the introduction above, a three-year catechumenate is comparable to the length of time spent before admission to philosophical schools.

## 18: On the prayer of the catechumens

<sup>1</sup>Whenever the teacher ceases to give instruction the catechumens should pray by themselves, separated from the faithful, <sup>2</sup>and the women should stand and pray by themselves in another place in the church, both women faithful and women catechumens. <sup>3</sup>When they have prayed they shall not give the kiss of peace for their kiss is not yet holy. <sup>4</sup>The faithful should greet one another, the men with each other and the women with each other. No man should greet a woman. <sup>5</sup>All the women should cover their head with a veil, but not with just a piece of linen, for that is no covering.

### COMMENT

1: In keeping with the scholastic orientation of this community note that regular instruction is not restricted to the catechumens but extends to the whole community.

2: Although Hippolytus' school was located in a domestic building, it is interesting that it should be referred to here as a "church." Like the house church of Dura Europos, and perhaps more pertinently like the house of Marcellus described in the *Acts of Peter*,<sup>200</sup> a domestic building has effectively been set aside for the activities of the religious community which uses it.

3: In the light of 21.6 below it would seem that the kiss of peace was the normal conclusion to prayer in P's community.

5: Tertullian in *On the veiling of virgins* 17 bears witness to the custom that Christian women should cover their heads in worship, and is somewhat scathing on the small pieces of linen which appear to have been widely employed for this purpose.

## 19: On laying hands on the catechumens

<sup>1</sup>When the teacher lays his hand on the catechumens after their prayer he should pray and dismiss them. Whether he be ecclesiastic or a lay-



man he should do so. <sup>2</sup>If a catechumen should be arrested for the sake of the name of the Lord he should not be double-minded in respect of his witness. For if violence is brought against him and he is killed before receiving baptism for the remission of his sins he will be justified. For he has received baptism in his own blood.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

2: There is some confusion in the Coptic text here, and Till and Leipoldt<sup>201</sup> are followed by Cuming<sup>202</sup> in suggesting that the phrase "before receiving baptism," supplied here from the Ethiopic version, has fallen out.

#### COMMENT

1: This is certainly part of P, for teaching, in the time of <sup>R</sup>EI, is concentrated in the hands of the bishop and by the time of <sup>R</sup>CN has become the duty of the college of presbyters, though at an earlier period teachers were entirely independent.<sup>203</sup> Admittedly *Commentary on Daniel* 1.17 knows of a "choir" of teachers distinct from the clergy, but as this is in Heaven that probably represents a memory of a situation such as that described in this chapter, rather than the real situation obtaining at the time of <sup>R</sup>CN. Because the dismissal is performed by a teacher rather than a liturgical president we may be clear that this is not a dismissal of catechumens before the celebration of any sacramental rite,<sup>204</sup> but simply a regular dismissal after a meeting in the church for instruction.

2: The usage "double-minded" is interesting as it is a favorite phrase of Hermas, deriving from Jewish usage;<sup>205</sup> its appearance here, as in *I Clement*, may indicate a common usage within Roman Christianity.

A similar statement concerning the "baptism in blood" is found in Tertullian, *On Baptism* 16.

#### 20: Of those who will receive baptism

<sup>1</sup>When those who are to receive baptism are chosen their lives should be examined; whether they lived uprightly as catechumens, whether they honored the widows, whether they visited the sick, whether they were

thorough in performing good works; <sup>2</sup>and if those who brought them bear witness that they have acted thus, so they should hear the Gospel. <sup>3</sup>From the time they are set apart a hand is laid on them daily whilst they are exorcized. When the day of their baptism draws near the bishop should exorcise each of them so that he may be sure that they are pure. <sup>4</sup>If there is one of them who is not good or is not pure he should be put to one side, because he has not heard the word in faith. For it is impossible that the alien spirit should remain with him. <sup>5</sup>Those who have been set apart for baptism should be instructed to bathe themselves and wash on the fifth day of the week. <sup>6</sup>And if a woman is in the manner of women she should be put aside and should receive baptism another day. <sup>7</sup>Those who are to be baptized should fast on the day of preparation for the Sabbath. On the Sabbath those who are to be baptized are gathered at the will of the bishop in one place. They shall be instructed to pray and to bend the knee. <sup>8</sup>And when he lays his hand on them he shall exorcize them of every foreign spirit and they shall flee away from them and shall not return to them. And when he has finished exorcizing them he should blow on their faces; and when he has sealed their forehead, their ears and their noses he should make them stand up. <sup>9</sup>They should spend the entire night in vigil, hearing readings and receiving instruction. <sup>10</sup>Those who are to be baptized should not bring anything with them, except what they bring for the eucharist. For it is fitting that those who are made worthy should bring an offering on that occasion.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

4: *Testamentum Domini* tidies up the last strange statement with "the foreign spirit has remained with him," a version followed by Dix.<sup>206</sup> The Sahidic is, however, retained here; for an attempt at interpretation see the comment.

5: The Sahidic version has "bathe themselves and free themselves and wash themselves." Botte suggests that this reading derives from a confusion between *eiō* (to wash) and *eire* (to make), to which a later scribe added the word "free."<sup>207</sup> It is far simpler to suggest that a doublet entered the Greek version through the similarity of the words *luō* (to set free) and *louō* (to wash).

## COMMENT

1: Dix has a sub-heading "scrutiny" here.<sup>208</sup> The scrutinies are known from later western rites. In the Gelasian sacramentary, reflecting Roman practice from around the sixth century, the first scrutiny takes place on the third Sunday of Lent (assuming a baptism at Easter).<sup>209</sup> Although it has by this stage become a ceremony with no clear meaning, it would seem to correspond to this enrollment for baptism. Egeria records a similar rite in fourth century Jerusalem, in which sponsors are asked concerning the conduct of catechumens before the catechumens begin instruction.<sup>210</sup>

2: The Sahidic version seems to retain a vestige of direct speech: namely that the sponsors stated: "he has acted thus."

We are not to understand, as do Easton and Whitaker, that only at this stage the catechumens remain to hear the liturgical Gospel in the assembly,<sup>211</sup> for this would indicate a rather more organized approach to the liturgy of the word than the rest of *Apostolic Tradition* exhibits. The probable meaning is that from this point on they are instructed in the Gospels. The Gelasian sacramentary contains a rite in which the opening passages of all four Gospels are read and a brief explanation of the fourfold Gospel canon is given. In the later Roman rite this is tied up to the third scrutiny, but by this time the number of scrutinies has been expanded, and so it is quite possible that this rite was originally tied to the first scrutiny. The candidates are, at this stage, taught the creed which they are to recite in the baptismal waters, and is, in the Gelasian sacramentary, repeated in both Greek and Latin, which is an indication of the antiquity of the rite. There is no clearly corresponding ritual in *Apostolic Tradition*, but the connection of the two in the sacramentaries may well indicate that this too was tied up to teaching from the Gospel; thus the candidates do not receive a new liturgical privilege of hearing the Gospel but enter a new pedagogical stage in being taught the fundamental content of the Gospel which is summarized in the creed.

Finally it is to be noted that catechumens enrolled for baptism are known in later Roman practice as *electi*, chosen ones. The term is reminiscent of that used here, which is further indication of the close relationship between this rite and that known later in Rome.

3: There is no clear indication of a time-period in either statement. In Ter-

tullian's Africa, however, the bishop exorcised each candidate a week prior to baptism.<sup>212</sup> The Gelasian sacramentary has a scrutiny a week prior to baptism, and so the exorcism mentioned here is probably the ancestor of that same rite.

4: The Sahidic is obscure, but the probable explanation is that it follows on from the statement that the catechumen has not heard in faith. In other words, had the catechumen listened faithfully the foreign spirit would not have remained. Alternatively we might understand the phrase in the light of the assertions of Theodotus that it is possible that, were evil spirits to enter the baptismal waters and be baptized, they would be sealed within the candidate, without the possibility of escape.<sup>213</sup> The candidates are sealed in this rite, in order to prevent the entry of evil spirits, and *Apostolic Tradition* is moreover concerned that foreign objects should not enter the baptismal water (though this is a secondary justification of an older practice whose original purpose was forgotten),<sup>214</sup> and so it is possible that this is the rationale. Theodotus suggests that fasting and exorcism should take place before baptism so that this might not occur, and Leeper goes on to suggest that the practice of fasting and exorcism so recommended had derived from Valentinus, who was also responsible for its introduction to Rome, where it has become part of the practice known in *Apostolic Tradition*.<sup>215</sup> This is not impossible, in that Valentinus' community was, like that of Hippolytus and that of P, founded upon a school system, but the thread is nonetheless tenuous.

5: Easton explains the two washings satisfactorily by suggesting that a bath in a public bath is followed by a final wash at home. The custom of candidates bathing on the Thursday prior to baptism is known in fifth century Africa.<sup>216</sup> Dix here has the heading "Maundy Thursday"<sup>217</sup> and Cuming comments that it is commonly assumed that Hippolytus intends an Easter baptism.<sup>218</sup> There is no direct evidence that this is the case. Tertullian has a preference for baptism at Pascha or Pentecost, but admits baptism at any time.<sup>219</sup> The Hippolytean school was quite possibly Quartodeciman in origin,<sup>220</sup> and there is no evidence that Quartodecimans practised baptism at Easter. However, Quartodeciman practice was abandoned by the time of R<sup>CN</sup>, and *Commentary on Daniel* 1.16 describes Easter as a most fitting day for baptism. Thus it is possible that Easter is intended, as this is not part of "Hippolytus'" work, but derives from P; Easter baptism may have been part

of the practice of the wider Roman church represented by P, which the Hippolytean community adopted under <sup>R</sup>CN. Since, as we have seen, the pattern of scrutinies accords with that known later in the Roman church, and which were fitted to the administration of baptism at Easter, it seems probable that P knew baptism at Easter.

7: Pre-baptismal fasting is also found in Justin's community (*First Apology* 61). The rite of the Gelasian sacramentary for the morning of Holy Saturday concludes with the instruction to pray and bend the knee, though no prayer follows, which is an implication that this is a survival of instruction in the art of prayer.

8: The sealing is intended to seal up any entrances into which an evil spirit might attempt a return. The Gelasian sacramentary likewise knows a final exorcism on the Saturday morning, which is accompanied by a rite called the *effeta*, in which the ears and nostrils of the *electi* are touched with spittle. This would seem to be a secondary historicization (with reference to Mark 7:34) of the same rite, with the opposite intention of the original action. John the Deacon, at the beginning of the sixth century, shows no knowledge of the use of spittle or of the *effeta* formula, and gives the same explanation of the rite as that found here.<sup>221</sup>

1-8: The close proximity of this description of the closing stages of the catechumenate to the later Roman system of scrutinies might well raise the suspicion that it is an interpolation from a later period. However, in favor of its originality the following should be noted:

a) The system first known in detail in the Gelasian sacramentary is ancient, as witnessed through the *traditio symboli* in Greek. Greek ceased to be the language of the Roman church in, probably, the middle of the third century; the first Latin-speaking leading presbyter was Victor at the end of the second century, and from the time of the unification of the Hippolytean community to the majority Roman church before or during the episcopate of Pontianus there is little evidence that Greek was widely used.

b) The later Roman system must have derived from some origin, and would hardly have sprung forth fully-formed at the time of Gregory the Great; given the antiquity of the *traditio symboli* at least, the late second and early third century is as likely a time as any.

c) Although we must continue to stress that the Hippolytean commu-

nity was one Roman community among many, and that its practices cannot therefore be taken as in any way typical of third century Roman Christianity, the possibility that this chapter is derived from P, a document over which the Hippolytean redactor worked, means that such a system might well have been widespread among Roman churches at the end of the second century (before the redaction of <sup>R</sup>El) and would therefore have been as close to normative Roman practice as anything at that time. There was little change in the outward form of the catechumenal process in the periods which can be recorded; rather the changes take place in the manner in which the process took place, and so it is quite possible that the Gelasian sacramentary reflects the continuation of the widespread practice of Roman churches from a time even before the early third century, reflected in P and recoverable from the redactional efforts of <sup>R</sup>El.

9: Although this may be reminiscent of the paschal vigil, that is simply because the paschal vigil is the last remainder of a common practice. It is quite possible that the night of Saturday was the normal occasion of early Christian worship, since this followed on from Sabbath meetings in the synagogue. In the informal setting of early Christian gatherings this could easily be extended to take up the entire night, and in time transference to the morning would become natural.<sup>222</sup> Thus compare this to the account of Acts 20:7–12, where conversation and prophetic proclamation (replaced by the third century by the functionally equivalent reading and preaching) go on all night, and conclude with a meal.<sup>223</sup>

10: See the detached comment on offering after 6.2.

## 21: On the handing over of holy baptism

*1 Now at the time when the cock crows they shall first pray over the water. 2 The water should be flowing into the tank or be poured down into it. It should be so if there is no necessity, but if there is continuous and sudden necessity use any water you can find. 3 And they should take off their clothes. 4 You are to baptize the little ones first. All those who are able to speak for themselves should speak. With regard to those who*

cannot speak for themselves their parents, or somebody who belongs to their family, should speak. <sup>5</sup>Then baptize the grown men and finally the women, after they have let down their hair and laid down the gold and silver ornaments which they have on them. Nobody should take any alien object down into the water. <sup>6</sup>And at the time determined for baptism the bishop shall give thanks over the oil and put it into a vessel and call it the oil of thanksgiving. <sup>7</sup>And he shall take other oil and perform the exorcism over it and call it the oil of exorcism.

<sup>8</sup>And a deacon brings the oil of exorcism and places himself on the left hand of the presbyter, and another deacon takes the oil of thanksgiving and stands on the right hand of the presbyter. <sup>9</sup>And when the presbyter takes hold of each of those who are to be baptized he should bid him renounce saying: "I renounce you Satan, and all your service and all your works."

<sup>10</sup>And when he has renounced all this he should anoint him with the oil of exorcism saying to him: "Let all evil spirits depart far from you."

<sup>11</sup>Then he should hand him over to the bishop or the presbyter who stands at the water to baptize; and they should stand in the water naked. And a deacon likewise should go down with him into the water.

<sup>12</sup>When the one being baptized goes down into the waters the one who baptizes, placing a hand on him, should say thus: "Do you believe in God the Father Almighty?"

<sup>13</sup>And he who is being baptized should reply: "I believe."

<sup>14</sup>Let him baptize him once immediately, having his hand placed upon his head. <sup>15</sup>And after this he should say: "Do you believe in Christ Jesus, the son of God, who was born of the Holy Spirit and Mary the virgin and was crucified under Pontius Pilate and was dead [and buried] and rose on the third day alive from the dead and ascended in the heavens and sits at the right hand of the Father and will come to judge the living and the dead?"

*16And when he has said, "I believe," he is baptized again.*

*17And again he should say: "Do you believe in the Holy Spirit and the holy church and the resurrection of the flesh?"*

*18And he who is being baptized should say: "I believe." And so he should be baptized a third time.*

*19And afterwards, when he has come up from the water, he is anointed by the presbyter with that sanctified oil, saying: "I anoint you with holy oil in the name of Jesus Christ."*

*20And afterwards, each drying himself, they shall dress themselves, and afterwards let them go into the church. (Dix: 22) 21And the bishop, laying his hand on them invokes, saying:*

*"Lord God, you have made them worthy to deserve the remission of sins through the laver of regeneration: make them worthy to be filled with the Holy Spirit, send your grace upon them that they may serve you in accordance with your will; for to you is glory, to the Father and the Son with the Holy Spirit in the holy church both now and to the ages of the ages. Amen."*

*22After this, pouring the sanctified oil from his hand and putting it on his head he shall say: "I anoint you with holy oil in God the Father Almighty and Christ Jesus and the Holy Spirit." 23And signing him on the forehead he shall give him the kiss and say: "The Lord be with you." And he who has been signed shall say: "And with your spirit." 24And thus he shall do to each. 25And thenceforth they shall pray with all the people; they shall not pray with the people until they have performed all these things. 26And after they have prayed they should give the kiss of peace.*

*27(Dix: 23) And then let the oblation be brought at once by the deacons to the bishop, and let him give thanks over the bread as the antitype of the body of Christ; and the cup mixed with wine on account of the likeness of the blood which was shed for all who have put their faith in him.*



<sup>28</sup>At the same time milk and honey mixed in fulfillment of the promise which was to the fathers, which stated "a land flowing with milk and honey," which Christ gave as his flesh, through which those who believe are nourished just like little children, the serenity of his word making sweet the bitterness of the heart. <sup>29</sup>And water is offered as a sign of the washing, so that the inner person, which is made up of the soul, should receive the same as the body.

<sup>30</sup>And the bishop should give an address concerning all these things to those who receive.

<sup>31</sup>Breaking the bread, and handing fragments to each he shall say: "Heavenly bread in Christ Jesus."

<sup>32</sup>And the one who receives shall reply: "Amen."

<sup>33</sup>The presbyters, and if there are not enough the deacons also, shall hold the cups; they should stand in good order [and with reverence]. First the one who holds the water, second the one with milk, third the one with the wine.

<sup>34</sup>And they who partake shall taste of each cup three times, as he who gives says: "In God the Father Almighty."

And the one who receives shall say: "Amen."

<sup>35</sup>"And in the Lord Jesus Christ."

And he shall say: "Amen."

<sup>36</sup>"And in the Holy Spirit and the holy church." And he shall say: "Amen."

<sup>37</sup>And thus let it be done to each.

<sup>38</sup>And when these things are done, let each hurry to do good works, to please God and to live properly, being devoted to the church, putting into action what he has learnt and progressing in piety.

<sup>39</sup>We have handed over to you in brief these things about holy baptism

and the holy offering, since you have already been instructed about the resurrection of the flesh and the other things according to the Scriptures.  
 40 But if anything else should be said, the bishop shall say it privately to those who have received. Unbelievers must not get to know it, unless they first receive. This is the white stone of which John said: "A new name is written on it, which nobody knows except him who receives."

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

Title: The Greek word *paradosis*, preserved here by the Sahidic translator, can mean "tradition" or "handing over." Whereas the second meaning is closer here, a hint is given here, as at v39 below, of the basis on which the title *Apostolic Tradition* was derived from P.

2: This is the Sahidic rendering;<sup>224</sup> Dix prefers that of the *Testamentum Domini*: "Let the water be pure and flowing."<sup>225</sup> Chadwick adds the comment that the Sahidic text might be original, but does not expand on this statement.

Dix prefers this reading because he believes that it is supported by the independent witness of *Canons of Hippolytus*. Even discounting the extensive rewriting which went into *Canons of Hippolytus*, this witness is not so absolutely clear, for it states that the candidates assemble by water flowing in a *bahr*, a word which could mean any body of water;<sup>226</sup> it thus possible that the translator found the word "tank." *Testamentum Domini* tends, by contrast to its usual procedure, to abbreviate here, thus at the parallel point to v4 it simply states that the women let down their hair, and moves the reference to the removal of ornaments to a later point. It is therefore not reliable at this point.

10: The Sahidic version omits "evil," but a word meaning something of this nature is present in all other versions.

11: Sahidic and Ethiopic read "bishop or presbyter" whereas the Arabic version reads "bishop"; it is therefore hard to see why Easton and Dix should read "presbyter"<sup>227</sup> (though see the comment below).

The Sahidic states that the bishop or presbyter stands "at the water which (or who) baptizes (*ebaptize*).<sup>228</sup> The translation here is based on the suggestion of Horner, adopted by Till and Leipoldt, who emend to *ebaptize*.<sup>228</sup>

12-13: These verses are translated, following the suggestion of Connolly,<sup>229</sup> according to the version of *Testamentum Domini*. The Sahidic version begins by having the deacon assist the candidate in making a declaratory creed, which then becomes an interrogatory creed. Beyond this the creed is much expanded, in many places clearly

postdating the Council of Constantinople (381). The Latin version, which resumes soon after this point, clearly indicates an interrogatory creed, which is present in *Testamentum Domini*. Thus although absolute confidence cannot be had in the text of these verses, of all the versions *Testamentum Domini* would appear to be closest to the original.

14: The Latin version resumes here.

15: The text as given here contains two divergences from the Latin version.

First, the Latin version states that Christ was born "of the Holy spirit *from* the virgin Mary" (Latin: *ex Maria*) whereas the translation here is based on the belief that the original read "and the virgin Mary" (Latin: *et Maria*). The textual error is simple enough, and Connolly cites passages from the pen both of <sup>8</sup>El and <sup>9</sup>CN (whom he believed to be the same person) stating that Christ was born of the Holy Spirit and the virgin. He further suggests that it would be difficult to express in Greek what is expressed here in the Latin. These seem more than sufficient grounds to make the emendation.

Second, the words "and buried" are given here in square brackets; they appear only in the Latin version and are almost certainly to be omitted. Contemporary statements of a credal nature mention nothing of the burial, whereas it is easy to see how the words "and buried" might creep into the text.<sup>230</sup> Botte adds the further argument that the "and" which precedes the word "dead" is unnecessary unless it originally ended the clause, in which case the following phrase must be interpolated.<sup>231</sup>

16: Whitaker comments that it is clear that the candidate is baptized not repeatedly, but once, and suggests that the underlying Greek was *baptizein*, meaning "dip," which was over-literally translated.<sup>232</sup> The Latin is retained here and below, but with reservations.

17: The text is given precisely following the Latin version. The other versions all read "In the Holy Spirit in the holy church." This reading is accepted by Dix and Botte; Botte in particular argues for this version on the grounds of the united witness of the other versions against the Latin.<sup>233</sup> Although the oriental witnesses are much interpolated and generally untrustworthy at this point, the normal Latin version of the creed would have read in accordance with the version here. There are therefore grounds for suspicion; as Holland notes, on purely textual grounds cogent arguments may be adduced for both readings.<sup>234</sup> However Holland goes on to point out that, in his argument with Stephen concerning the possibility of baptism or the forgiveness of sins outside of the church, Cyprian cites the African creed, which included an article of belief in "the forgiveness of sins and eternal life through the holy church" but does not cite the Roman creed which, had it read "in the Holy Spirit in the holy church" would have given Cyprian a powerful argument.<sup>235</sup> This, however, depends on assuming that Cyprian would have given a rather contentious reading to the

phrase; Botte points out that reading this as indicating that the church is the sole repository of the Spirit would be grammatically awkward.<sup>236</sup> In conclusion, the Latin version is preferred here solely on the grounds that this is the clause found in later Roman creeds, an argument with the further hypothetical basis that this creed is not the peculiar possession of Hippolytus' school but was widespread in Rome.

19: For "sanctified oil" all the other witnesses have "oil of thanksgiving." Botte suggests that the Latin translator is being over-literal.<sup>237</sup> It is more probable that the translators of the versions are trying to make sense of the confusion caused by the interpolation of verses 6-7 (on which see the comment below).

20: The Latin version is infelicitous, and so Dix suggests the phrase is better rendered "let them be together in the assembly."<sup>238</sup> Tidner is happier emending the text slightly from *in ecclesia* to *in ecclesiam*,<sup>239</sup> which is the basis of the rendering here.

21: There is significant divergence in this prayer between the Latin version, which reads:

Lord God, you have made them worthy to deserve the remission of sins through the laver of regeneration of the Holy Spirit: send your grace upon them that they may serve you in accordance with your will; for to you is glory, to the Father and the Son with the Holy Spirit in the holy church both now and to the ages of ages. Amen.

and the Bohairic, Arabic, Ethiopic and Syriac versions which, whilst there are minor differences between them, would indicate something close to the translation given above.

Dix gives the oriental version, and bluntly states that the Latin is corrupt,<sup>240</sup> and Botte believes that a line is missing in that version through haplography. It is clear, he suggests, given the unanimity of the other versions that there were two verbs which meant "make worthy," and that this was the cause of the omission since the eye of the scribe skipped from the first appearance to the next.<sup>241</sup> Botte's reconstruction is that translated above.

However Cuming gives a translation of the Latin version of the prayer,<sup>242</sup> under the influence of Lampe, who had pointed out that the Latin makes sense as it stands.<sup>243</sup> Certainly it is true that, had the other versions not existed, we would not suspect the Latin version but the unanimity of their witness and the relative ease with which the divergences can be explained conspire against Lampe, who can only account for the other versions on the grounds that they have been deliberately altered.<sup>244</sup> But there is no reason why this should have taken place, as the post-baptismal gift of the Holy Spirit is not associated with episcopal handlaying in eastern rites as it is in western, but with the post-baptismal chrismation.

Finally Gelston attempts a more extensive emendation, combining both texts

and thus retaining mention of the Holy Spirit in the places found in both the Latin and the oriental versions.<sup>245</sup> His reconstruction would read as follows:

Lord God, you have made them worthy to deserve the remission of sins through the laver of regeneration of the Holy Spirit: make them worthy to be filled with the Holy Spirit, send your grace upon them that they may serve you in accordance with your will . . .

This reconstruction has the merit of retaining a reference to Titus 3:5 which is only present in the Latin version, but is more complex to explain on textual grounds, and frankly would need recourse once again to deliberate scribal alteration.<sup>246</sup> Finally Cuming, in an article published later than his translation, suggests that the original relative clause at the beginning had been "made them worthy to deserve the remission of sins," and that it went on to ask that grace be sent upon the candidates. At a later stage, two separate scribes made two separate expansions, one suggesting that the Holy Spirit was active in the water, the other adding a prayer for the coming of the Holy Spirit in order to tie it to the laying on of episcopal hands.<sup>247</sup> That two scribes should alter the same prayer at the same point in two such different ways whilst leaving the rest untouched strains credibility somewhat, especially since it is hard to see a rationale for either alteration in the third or fourth century east.

Botte's rendition is to be accepted in that it needs no special pleading, takes account of all the evidence, and is easily explained.

22: Instead of "putting it on his head," *Testamentum Domini* has "putting his hand upon his head." This is supported by the Bohairic version, though this is probably the translator's rationalization, as it is unsupported by the Arabic or Ethiopic versions. Dix states, on the grounds that this is the practice in the Syrian *Didascalia* and Tertullian, that *Testamentum Domini* "is the right reading." However, we should not look to the *Didascalia* or Tertullian because these are independent rites. The Latin version makes sense as it stands.

Latin has "In the Lord Father Almighty"; *Do* has been written as *dno*.

23: The word rendered as "signed" is *sphragizein* (the Greek word is preserved in the Coptic) which is often translated "seal."

27: Dix comments that "this archaic passage has given trouble to the versions," and that the (Arabic and) Ethiopic correct the theology.<sup>248</sup> We thus fall back on the Latin version, which actually reads: "Let him give thanks over the bread into the example (which the Greek calls antitype) of the body of Christ; and the cup mixed with wine on account of the antitype (which the Greek calls the likeness) of the blood which was shed for all who have put their faith in him." This is clearly confused, yet seems to retain the original vocabulary, and the rendering offered here is therefore based on the conjectural reconstruction of Botte.<sup>249</sup>

30: Following the Latin translator, Dix renders the word here translated as "address"

with "explanation" Cumming with "reason" and Botte with "rendre compte."<sup>250</sup> The Sahidic version however retains the original Greek word *logos*. *Logos* might mean "rationale," which is the understanding of the word which the Latin translator had, but it has a wide range of possible significance; we may thus suggest that this chapter contains hints of the content of the prayer which the bishop is to make, since prayer is elsewhere compared to declamation at 9.3, and since the line between discourse and liturgical prayer was somewhat fine in the primitive church,<sup>251</sup> the word is translated accordingly, indicating that the address is bound up to the offering. This would not have been understood by the Latin translator.

33: Botte notes that the good order to which reference is made is that of the cups, which is indicated by the Greek word *eutaxia*, preserved in the Sahidic version; the Latin translator appears to have thought that the instruction applied to those holding the cups, and Botte therefore suggests that the words "with reverence" is a gloss.<sup>252</sup> The words are retained in the translation, but in square brackets.

34: As Cumming points out, the passage might also be translated: "And they who partake shall taste of each cup, as he who gives says three times . . ."<sup>253</sup> The context seems however to demand the translation given here.

35: No reply is given in the Latin, but is supplied here in line with the suggestion of Botte.<sup>254</sup>

36: The Latin version alone has "and the holy church," whereas the others all have "in the holy church"; see however the discussion of this same phrase at 21.17 above.

38: Latin breaks off again in the middle of this verse.

39: Sahidic "in brief," Ethiopic and Arabic "openly."

The final phrase reads literally "according to the things written"; although this does not necessarily refer to the Scriptures, it commonly does so. Easton takes it as referring to some other work of Hippolytus,<sup>255</sup> though if this is taken from P that is unlikely.

40: Sahidic completes the phrase "received" with "baptism." It is equally possible however that the reception of the eucharist is meant. The Ethiopic and Arabic versions contain the verb only.

#### COMMENT

1: Compare Tertullian *On Baptism* 4.4. Fisher suggests that the practice of consecrating water for baptism came about once flowing water was no longer used,<sup>256</sup> but note, however, the comment on verse 2 below.

2: Dix prefers the text of *Testamentum Domini* here because of the agree-

ment of *Testamentum Domini* and *Canons of Hippolytus* (on which see the comment on the text and translation above). He further argues that a baptistry would not have developed by the time of Hippolytus and that in this light the Sahidic text appears to have undergone some editing. It is, however, far from impossible that a baptistry might have existed by the time of Hippolytus, that is to say that a separate room in a house or on a covered forecourt might be employed for baptisms and a room within the house set aside for use by the Christian assembly.<sup>257</sup> Certainly in Africa by this time tanks were normally employed for baptism and the preference for flowing water forgotten.<sup>258</sup> Nonetheless the text lying behind the Sahidic translation does appear to have been augmented through the addition of "flowing into the tank . . ."; yet this need not mean that the text as it stands is not that of *Apostolic Tradition*, for it is possible that the text of P has been edited, either by <sup>R</sup>El or <sup>R</sup>CN, in which case the phrase as it stands is "original." If this is the case, P would have stated that the water should be flowing, and the reference to the tank added by the subsequent editor, at a time at which tanks had come into use in domestic Christianity.

Flowing water was preferred in Judaism for the various ritual baths required simply because it has better cleansing properties, and so enters the Christian tradition from this source. This connection is denied by Werblowsky on the grounds that running water was not generally mandatory;<sup>259</sup> but although not mandatory it was preferred, which is precisely the situation here.

3: With the exception of the Elchasites, this was the practice known throughout the ancient church. <sup>R</sup>El at *Refutation* 9.15 pours scorn on Elchasite, fully clothed, baptism. On the importance of the whole body making contact with the water see the comment on verse 5 below.

4: The Greek word *genos*, here translated "family," would naturally indicate a member of the extended family. Parents, naturally, have authority over the child and might therefore speak on behalf of the child; parents might appoint guardians for a child in the event of their death, but otherwise guardianship passed to an agnate relative, that is to say a relative of the child through the child's father; typically the agnate relative would be the father's brother or the father's brother's son. The guardian, or *tutor*, had legal responsibility for the child. This is probably the scenario which is envisaged here. Minors might enter contracts and make stipulations (see below) with-

out the consent of the *tutor* as long as they did not part with anything as a result, and so *Apostolic Tradition* envisages that children who can speak here speak for themselves, whereas those who are too young to speak are under the authority in this regard of their parents or of their *tutor*, who is normally a member of the extended family.<sup>260</sup> Inscriptional evidence of the baptism of young children in third century Rome is available.<sup>261</sup>

5: Van Unnik points out that in the early third century women would usually wear their hair in a bun, and that this was considered a decent and proper style; significantly the wicked women clad in black of Hermas *Similitude* 9.9.5 have their hair let down. He suggests two reasons for the prescription in *Apostolic Tradition* that hair be let down, preferring the second. His first is that undone hair and the removal of jewelry was a sign of mourning; however, he notes that there is not a sufficient connection between mourning habits and the situation of those being baptized. He therefore suggests that the provisions in rabbinic sources which suggest in a similar way that women undergoing ritual bathing after menstruation should have their hair let down and their jewelry removed are the source of this prescription. The hair was let down and jewelry removed in order that the water might make contact with every part of the body, including all of the hair. He suggests that proselyte baptism derived from the same purificatory origin and that the provisions of the rabbinic literature and those of *Apostolic Tradition* derive from the same origin.<sup>262</sup> Although the date of proselyte baptism and its relationship to Christian baptism is much disputed, the rationale for the removal of jewelry and the loosening of hair fits the context here well and both may ultimately derive, as van Unnik suggests, from the bathing practice of first-century Palestine. Van Unnik however overstates his case, as Werblowsky points out,<sup>263</sup> in seeing the let-down hair as a sign of impurity; it makes most sense to see the provisions both of the rabbis and of *Apostolic Tradition* deriving from the purely practical provision that water should make contact with every part of the body. The statement which follows concerning the importation of alien objects into the water is a secondary justification of an act whose origin is no longer understood.

On the jewelry which the women might be wearing see Tertullian *On the apparel of women* 1.9, who describes necklaces, rings on the left hand and earrings.

6–7: These two verses are intrusive for two reasons. First, they take us back



to the beginning of the rite; and second, they introduce the figure of the bishop, who has not been present thus far, and who now disappears once again from the action. We shall note below that although it is just about possible to make sense of the rite as *Apostolic Tradition* describes it, the fundamental description seems to be of a presbyteral baptism into which the bishop has intruded; the fact that it is possible to envisage the baptism as it is described in the present redaction of *Apostolic Tradition* is indicative of the success of the redactor. It is therefore possible that these verses are a gloss on the action, in the original version of which the existence of the two oils would have been assumed. On the basis of the prominent role of the bishop at this point we may further suggest that the gloss is provided by <sup>R</sup>El.

9: The candidate makes this statement, prompted by the presbyter. The Greek word underlying "service" is, as Botte points out, probably *pompē*. *Testamentum Domini* here has "your worship and your displays and your pleasures" which, Botte suggests, is a threefold translation of the one word, bringing out the shades of meaning implicit in the original word.<sup>264</sup>

10: The eastern liturgies at this point knew a rite of adhesion (*suntaxis*) complementing this renunciation (*apotaxis*). A *suntaxis* is inserted here in *Testamentum Domini* and *The Canons of Hippolytus*, but there is no reason for thinking it original.<sup>265</sup>

11: As noted in the discussion of text and translation, Easton and Dix both read "presbyter" at this point. There are no textual grounds for this reading, but it is possible that they are trying to make sense of the rite, which is fundamentally presbyteral, by excluding the bishop at this point and restricting his function to the blessing of the oils and the post-baptismal handlaying, which in time became the specifically episcopal functions in Christian initiation. Certainly the bishop's appearance here is strange, and may be the result of interpolation by <sup>R</sup>El. Easton further comments that "the pronouns are ambiguous and confusing, but the sense seems to be that the presbyter who performs the actual baptism stands on the bank of the stream (or the edge of the font) while the deacon stands in the water with the candidate, to instruct and assist him."<sup>266</sup> It would however be easier to envisage if the presbyter put the questions while the deacon infused the water.

12–18: The interrogatory form of the creed comes about through the Roman practice of *stipulatio*, the normal method under Roman law of entering into

a contract. The contract was formed by two parties through a practice of questioning, to which affirmative answer is given by repeating the verbs contained in the question in the first person. Such a contract was binding on both parties.<sup>267</sup> Thus the response *credo* ("I believe") in each case is the contractual agreement on the basis of which baptism is given each time. This procedure of interrogation followed by repeated dippings is still found in the Gelasian sacramentary.

19: The earliest evidence of the practice of post-baptismal anointing at Rome comes from Tertullian's *Against Marcion* 1.14 where, in arguing that Marcion has retained against his own logic certain elements of catholic ritual, Tertullian tells us that Marcion's followers are baptized and anointed, as well as being fed with milk and honey. Whether or not this was native Roman practice, it was clearly Marcionite practice at Rome; we may therefore reasonably suspect that this anointing derives from P.

21: Much of the debate concerning the text of this prayer is fuelled by the assumption that the origin of the western rite, which came to be called confirmation, is to be found here. Lampe's fundamental interest in this text is theological, and he wishes to prove that Hippolytus believed that the remission of sins in the water was the work of the Holy Spirit, and that he held no belief in any subsequent pneumatic activity. He attempts to find such a belief in the writings of Hippolytus, but two of the works he cites are pseudonymous and those which are not add little to his case;<sup>268</sup> for although he states that the idea that the Spirit's presence in the water is "clearly expressed" in the *Benediction of Jacob*,<sup>269</sup> there is no such clarity. *Benediction of Jacob* 202–204 states that Jesus received the Spirit "in the Jordan" but not that it is from the Jordan, indeed it states that Jesus received the Spirit whilst coming out of the river.<sup>270</sup> The textual issue cannot be answered through an examination of the works of the Hippolytean school for, as has already been noted several times, neither author has an adequate pneumatology; *Refutation* 10.34.5 states that Christ arranged to wash away sins and to regenerate the old man, and that in this light the audience of the work should be obedient and faithful, and so be honored by Christ, but there is no indication of the role the Holy Spirit should play in this. <sup>R</sup>CN does, however, identify the oil with which Susannah anoints herself in her bath with post-baptismal unction which conveys the power of the Spirit, and elsewhere he speaks of the spirit sealing the believer subsequently to speaking of the laver of regen-

eration;<sup>271</sup> thus, if anything, the extant work of the Hippolytean school would tend to support the eastern versions against the Latin.

Kavanagh, in seeking the origin of confirmation here, argues that the post-baptismal ceremonies found in Hippolytus have the shape of a *missa*, and that they are therefore intended to send the newly baptized into the Christian assembly. He perceives of this *missa* taking place at the physical entry to the main room of the house-church in which the eucharist is celebrated.<sup>272</sup> Kavanagh's observations are perceptive, since the post-baptismal rites of *Apostolic Tradition* indeed have the structure of a *missa* and this is certainly the manner in which we are to perceive the action as it is described in the extant document;<sup>273</sup> it is, however, significant that the *missae* to which that of *Apostolic Tradition* is closest are derived from eastern rites,<sup>274</sup> which raises the further question of whether the rites of Hippolytus, startlingly similar as they are to the later complex of western post-baptismal ceremonies which became confirmation, are indeed the origin of that rite. I have argued elsewhere that they are not, but that this ritual derives from African rites.<sup>275</sup> Much of the debate is in any event fruitless, as there is no actual epiklesis of the Holy Spirit in the prayer here, for the prayer that the newly-baptized may be worthy to receive the Spirit is not an invocation of the Spirit on the candidates but is a prayer that the candidates may merit being filled with the Spirit at a later point, perhaps in their reception of the eucharistic gifts, but more probably in the subsequent episcopal unction.

Further to Kavanagh's observation we should note that the *missa* is something of an intrusion into the flow of the ritual, and finally should observe that the bishop has once again appeared in the midst of the fundamentally presbyteral rite.

22: Cuming blithely comments: "A second post-baptismal anointing is unparalleled until the Gelasian Sacramentary."<sup>276</sup> It is hardly likely that the two are related for, in the Gelasian sacramentary, the second anointing takes the form of a consignation and has apparently developed from that rite. We might wonder why the intervening centuries know no second post-baptismal unction, and suggest that this second (episcopal) unction has been added to the earlier presbyteral anointing by <sup>R</sup>El.

23: A concluding consignation is not known to Tertullian but is known to Cyprian.<sup>277</sup> The kiss of peace shared here between the bishop and the newly baptized is duplicated at v26 below.

25: This verse follows on naturally from v20, again implying that the intervening material is interpolated.

26: Prayer after baptism, followed by the kiss of peace, is also the pattern found at Justin's *First Apology* 65. Although the prayers mentioned by Justin include prayer for the newly-baptized, in the light of *Apostolic Tradition* 18.1-4 we should not think that this procedure was essentially any different from that which usually obtained.<sup>278</sup>

1-26: In essence this chapter derives from P; we have suspected two minor interpolations, at v2 and v11, but have also noted that verses 6-7 are intrusive, in particular because they interrupt the flow of the rite to take the reader back to the beginning of the ritual. That the bishop is suddenly introduced at this point leads one to suspect that the interpolation is the work of <sup>R</sup>El. After v20 a further interpolation was suspected, as v25 follows naturally on from v20, whereas in the extant text the entry to the assembly is interrupted with the sudden re-appearance of the bishop. Beyond this there are two duplications in these verses. The episcopal anointing duplicates the presbyteral anointing at v19, and the kiss of peace shared with the bishop alone at v23 is then duplicated as it is shared between the newly baptized and all the people at v26; here, after the prayers, would seem to be the normal position in which this rite was known in P's community (so 18.3). The intrusions, the duplications and the disjunctions all conspire to suggest redactional activity which, given the prominence of the bishop in the apparently redactional material, is best assigned to <sup>R</sup>El.

The significance attached to such a conclusion will vary with the reader, but two points emerge for the translator:

a) Discussion of "Hippolytus" in the debate about confirmation should note that the elements of "confirmation" in the rite are secondary, though ancient nonetheless, in that they derive from the usage of <sup>R</sup>El; their object however would seem to be less concerned with the sacramental effect on the candidate, but rather intended to bring the bishop to the center of activity in initiation. In this light we may reiterate the absence of any explicit invocation of the Holy Spirit on the candidates.

b) P, the document which <sup>R</sup>El has interpolated, is of even greater antiquity. A conservative dating would put it at 175, and it could well be contemporary with Justin's account at *First Apology* 61.

27: On the role of the deacons in bringing up the offerings see 4.2 and 8.11 above.

In observing the language here employed of the eucharist, Cuming notes Tertullian *Against Marcion* 4.40.<sup>279</sup> Before turning to that parallel, however, we should note that the anaphora of *Apostolic Constitutions* 7, in giving thanks for the precious blood and body of Christ, states that "we perform the antitypes," that Sarapion, in his anaphora, refers to the offered elements as the likeness (*homoïōma*) of the body and the likeness of the blood of Christ, and that Ambrose *On the Sacraments* 4.25 cites the anaphora as offering the likeness (*figura*) of the body and blood of Christ. There is abundant evidence therefore of the use of the terminology found here in ancient eucharistic prayer, and we may therefore suggest, in line with Mazza, that Tertullian, who describes the eucharistic bread as the "figure (*figura*) of the body of Christ" in arguing against Marcion's docetism, derived this language from that of prayer.<sup>280</sup> His point, as Mazza makes clear, is that if the eucharistic gift is a figure there must be a reality to which the figure corresponds. Some language of this sort may lie behind Ephrem's assertion that the Marcionites have only the appearance of the blood of Christ in their cup;<sup>281</sup> the usage of the second century had become frozen among the separatist congregations, and is then employed for polemical purposes by their opponents, who do not recognize the "orthodox" history of the phraseology. We may therefore see that there is nothing distinctive or unusual in the terminology here, and that this may well be reminiscent of the pattern of eucharistic prayer common in the community which produced P. It appears again in P material at chapter 38.

28: The use of milk and honey is widely attested in Christian and other initiatory meals.<sup>282</sup> The explanation here might be indicative of the content of the *logos* which the bishop is to give in giving thanks,<sup>283</sup> in the same way that we suspected that the language of verse 27 betrayed liturgical usage. Some indication that this idea that the milk and honey are signs of the fulfillment of the promise was bound up to the eucharistic offering of these gifts may be found in the blessing of milk and honey in the Veronese sacramentary, which asks that the newly baptized be nourished and so enter into the land flowing with milk and honey in fulfillment of the promise made to the patriarchs.<sup>284</sup>

29: Water was frequently used in eucharistic meals in the ancient church;

most relevant as a parallel however is the use of a cup of water in the baptismal eucharist described by Justin *First Apology* 65; the question of whether wine was also used on this occasion is controversial.<sup>285</sup>

30: The address of prayer concerns each food, and all are offered. At the time of John the Deacon the mixture of milk and honey is still offered as part of the oblation; the first evidence of any distinction of these oblations from those of bread and wine is to be found in the 24th canon of the Council of Carthage in 327, which states that, although they are offered they should have a blessing of their own "so that they may be distinguished from the sacrament of the Lord's body and blood."<sup>286</sup> However we should be clear, in the light of the discussion of the offering of oil, cheese and olives above, that a series of individual prayers, rather than one single prayer, is envisaged, even though there is no intent to distinguish them from the other gifts.

31: See the *Benediction of Jacob*, 209–211, which describes the eucharist in precisely these Johannine terms; this, however, is to be attributed to tradition, as there is nothing peculiarly Hippolytean in this. Note the use of the term *klasmata* (fragments) which reappears in P material at 25.15 and 26.2 below. Peterson suggests, on the basis of the Latin *partes* (parts) that the Greek word here was not *klasma*, but *meris* (portion) and that the Sahidic translator has used a word familiar to him from the Egyptian liturgical tradition.<sup>287</sup> However, the word *meris* is found in the Sahidic version unaltered from the Greek at chapter 28.2 below.

34: Comment beyond that of McGowan is superfluous: "It has been suggested . . . that these cups of milk and honey, and of water, which feature along with bread and wine in this baptismal eucharist of the *Apostolic Tradition*, might be the remnant of a (solid) meal which was also the original setting of a separate ritual of the specifically eucharistic elements of bread and wine . . . Consideration of the broader meal evidence suggests in fact that three cups after the main part of a meal is quite to be expected; to use more than one on the paschal feast is, apart from anything else, an appropriate marker of the occasion. The cups are therefore probably a vestigial symposium. Hence it is the whole of this proceeding, including both the eucharistized bread and the multiple cups, which is both the eucharist proper and the remnant of a meal, rather than two sets of essentially separate acts."<sup>288</sup>

39: This is the phrase which indicated to Botte that a pre-existent block of material had been incorporated at this point, since it provides a conclusion to a self-contained section of the text.<sup>289</sup> We have further identified this as P.

40: Although this would appear to be a reference to the *disciplina arcani*, it is odd, since the *paradosis* has already told everything which is guarded by that discipline! We might moreover note that there is no evidence that the catechumens were dismissed before the faithful, simply that they had their own separate dismissal.<sup>290</sup>

Botte speculates that a mystagogical catechesis centered on the eucharist is intended,<sup>291</sup> and some support for this may be derived from the reference to the white stone of Revelation 2:17, which follows on from a promise that the one who is faithful will receive some of the hidden manna along with the white stone. However, P goes on to discuss the eucharist, and other ritual meals, and has moreover already discussed the offerings made at the time of baptism.

Easton suggests that the Lord's prayer is intended.<sup>292</sup> It is certainly noteworthy that no mention is made here, or elsewhere in *Apostolic Tradition* of the Lord's prayer, which in Africa at least was closely bound up to baptism. The Gelasian sacramentary has a solemn *traditio* of the Lord's prayer at the end of the catechumenate, which may imply that in Rome it was not originally taught to catechumens. It is thus possible that the preservation of the prayer from unbaptized or uncommunicated ear was part of the *disciplina arcani*, or even its entire extent, and in that light it is quite possible that this verse is a cryptic reference to that prayer.

## 22 (Dix 24)<sup>293</sup>

<sup>1</sup>On the first of the week the bishop, if he is able, should himself distribute to all the people with his own hand, while the deacons break.  
<sup>2</sup>And the presbyters break the bread they are given. When the deacon approaches the presbyter he should offer the paten, and the presbyter should take it himself and distribute it to the people with his own hand.

3 On other days they should receive according to the direction of the bishop.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

1: This chapter is extant in its entirety in Ethiopic only, and is translated directly from that source, though there are hints of it in the *Canons of Hippolytus* and in *Testamentum Domini*. The Ethiopic text begins: "On the seventh and the first day of the week . . ." whereas the *Canons of Hippolytus* mention only the seventh day. Although there is evidence of Christian gatherings on the Sabbath during the day in Syria and Smyrna there is none from Rome. Saturday is however a significant liturgical day in Ethiopia, and the version can thus be easily explained.<sup>294</sup>

2: The published Ethiopic text reads "the baked bread" for "the bread they are given." The reading "which they have been given" does however appear in two manuscripts of the Ethiopic version. Confusion between "baked" (*'afoya*) and "delivered" (*wefoya*) is understandable, and so the minority reading, which makes more sense, is accepted. Botte suggests that since the same phrase appears in the Ethiopic version at chapter 26 below it must be the correct reading,<sup>295</sup> but the same variation appears in the same manuscripts. Botte is moreover at a loss as to its meaning whereas the meaning here, which is the reading adopted by Dix,<sup>296</sup> makes complete sense.

Further the Ethiopic text states that the deacon should offer the "clothing" to the presbyter. Following Dix and Botte, who offer differing but equally convincing explanations of the error,<sup>297</sup> the translation reads "paten," which is the reading of *Testamentum Domini*.

#### COMMENT

1: Easton reckoned this chapter inauthentic as it is extant in the Ethiopic version alone,<sup>298</sup> but as Dix points out, the hints in *Testamentum Domini* and *Canons of Hippolytus* indicate that this chapter was available to the authors of those documents. He moreover points out the similarities with known Roman liturgical customs.<sup>299</sup> Finally he is able to suggest that the place of this chapter is logical following on from the directions concerning baptism. Indeed one may note that there is no break in the Ethiopic text. The sequence of teaching concerning the administration of the eucharist after that concerning baptism is what one would anticipate.

1-2: This apparently contradictory direction is explained by Dix with reference to later papal liturgies in which the bishop of Rome celebrates at the



altar whilst presbyters concelebrate with deacons holding patens before them.<sup>300</sup> The deacons however break the host which the bishop has consecrated. Each presbyter then breaks the host he has co-consecrated. The similarity between that practice and the practice regulated in this chapter is striking, and we may therefore agree that the chapter is ancient and Roman, though the origin of the practice is hard to perceive. Dix's suggestion that it derived from the narrowness of Roman altars<sup>301</sup> is similar to that of Duchesne, who suggests that the concelebrating presbyters are simply there to assist the bishop in view of the numbers present.<sup>302</sup> This simply does not explain the procedure. It is possible however that it has derived from the practice of the sending of the *fermentum* in the hands of deacons by the bishop.<sup>303</sup> The first evidence of the practice described by Dix is from the sixth century *Liber Pontificalis*, which assumes the presence of the presbyters at the bishop's single liturgy, which is hardly the situation which is described by Justin. But the presence of the presbyters at the liturgy may be a development from the practice described here, where the presbyters celebrated each in their own church, and received a portion from the bishop's eucharist which they were to distribute in turn to the people. This practice is in turn a development from that of an earlier period, when presbyters sent portions of the eucharist to other churches, a practice which is known in the second century.<sup>304</sup> Since, as we suggest below, the material is included by <sup>R</sup>CN from a source, the restriction of the practice to the monēpiscopos is not later than that of Pontianus, though it may precede him as the Roman episcopate had been moving towards monēpiscopacy since the time of Victor at least. Thus Dix is partly right, in that the practice he discerns as explaining this verse is derived from the practice which this verse actually describes, or rather of which it assumes knowledge. Thus the first verse directs that the bishop communicates those whom it is physically possible for him to communicate, namely those who are present at the eucharist which he offers, and the second verse directs the deacons to take the patens with the host to the presbyters in the city so that they may distribute the bishop's *fermentum* to the people. In time this became a rite in which the presbyters would physically gather and celebrate alongside the bishop.

3: Dix reasonably suggests that this refers to directions on the keeping of martyrs' feasts and the like.<sup>305</sup>

1–3: The practice described in this chapter does not fit comfortably with the

practice or outlook of <sup>8</sup>El since it supposes a single bishop with presbyters in other churches rather than a bishop heading up a single church, though this practice would certainly accord with the outlook and ecclesiastical setting of <sup>8</sup>CN, who sees the presbyters as sharing in the spirit of the bishop.

### 23 (Dix 25, 26.1a): On fasting

*Widows and virgins should fast often and pray for the church. Presbyters, should they wish, and laypersons may likewise fast. A bishop cannot fast except when all the people are fasting. It may be that somebody wishes to make an offering, and he cannot be refused. When he breaks he should always taste.*

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

This chapter is extant in Greek.<sup>306</sup> For "a bishop" the Sahidic text reads "the bishop."

#### COMMENT

*Apostolic Tradition* does not specify precisely when all the community is fasting. Although twice-weekly fasting by the whole community is known in the *Didache*,<sup>307</sup> and fasting on Friday is known to Tertullian,<sup>308</sup> but whether this extended to the Hippolytean community is not known. Fasting occurred before Pascha, though its duration in the Hippolytean community is likewise unknown, in view of the variety of time periods which the paschal fast might occupy.<sup>309</sup>

It is to be noted that fasting is allowed at liberty to presbyters and laypersons, and enjoined upon widows and virgins even when there is no corporate fast. One of the charges made against the Montanists was that they legislated strange and unknown fasts.<sup>310</sup> It seems from this passage that the objection made to the Montanists was not the frequency of their fasting but that the fasts were legislated rather than left to the determination of the individual.

It is hard to determine the redactional level of this passage. However it would seem to belong with 31 below, and if this is the case then we might see

this as the work of <sup>REI</sup>. That the existence of more than one bishop is implied through the absence of a definite article in the Greek version may be taken in support of that attribution.

## 24 (Dix: 26.14–15): On gifts to the sick

*<sup>1</sup>The deacon, in an emergency, shall give the sign to the sick with diligence if no presbyter is present, <sup>2</sup>and when he has given, for as long as is needful, so he shall himself accept what is to be apportioned, shall give thanks, and they shall consume it there. [That those who receive should serve diligently] [he shall give blessed bread.]*

*<sup>3</sup>If a person receives a gift which is to be given to a widow or to a poor woman or to a person busily occupied with the affairs of the church, he should hand it over on that same day. <sup>4</sup>If not, on the following day he should add to it from what is his and so give it, since the bread of the poor was delayed a while with him.*

### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

1–2: This chapter is rendered from the Ethiopic text, in which language alone the chapter is extant (though enough is found in *Testamentum Domini* to assure us of its authenticity). Dix attempted the following conjectural translation:

The deacon in time of need shall be diligent in giving the sealing to the sick. If there be no presbyter to give that which is to be distributed, as much as ought to be received (the deacon) shall give thanks and shall take note of those who take away (food to be distributed to the sick) that they perform this with care and distribute the blessed bread.<sup>311</sup>

Faced with this text, recourse to conjecture is forgivable, but there is simply not enough of the original text in Dix's version to convince, and parts of the text are absent. The translation here is close to that of Duensing;<sup>312</sup> Botte's translation is meaningless, as is that of Cuming.<sup>313</sup> The version above, however, accepts Botte's suggestions that the sentence beginning "that those who receive" is a title, and that the following statement is an explanatory gloss.<sup>314</sup> For these reasons the phrases are enclosed in square brackets. See further the comment below.

3-4: These verses are extant in *Testamentum Domini*, which is the version translated above, and in the Ethiopic version; the *Canons of Hippolytus* also has a version, which is thoroughly reworked. There are divergences among the versions. For "poor woman" the Ethiopic version reads "sick person." Dix suggests that the Greek word *penomenē* (poor woman) was misread as *ponoumenē* (sick woman).<sup>315</sup> Further the Ethiopic version suggests that a person occupied in the affairs of the church should be the one to take the gift, rather than a recipient.

#### COMMENT

1-2: "The sign" is interpreted by *Testamentum Domini* as baptism, but this usage is not employed elsewhere in the Hippolytean corpus. Dix suggests that unction is intended,<sup>316</sup> but once again there is no lexical support for this usage. Botte can make no suggestion. Although *sphragis*, a word employed in *Apostolic Tradition* to indicate the signing of the newly baptized with oil and the election of presbyters by presbyters, might be the word underlying "sign" here, it is possible that *antitypos* or *homoiōma*, words employed of the bread and wine which signify the Body of and Blood of Christ, is intended. In that event the chapter is stating that the deacon should distribute communion to the sick in the absence of a presbyter, in much the same way that the deacons administer cups and the baptismal mass if there are insufficient presbyters. The context would then demand us to suggest that what follows is a direction that, if there is insufficient, the deacon should receive bread and give thanks and distribute it; in other words, he is to celebrate the eucharist! In the comment on text and translation above Botte's suggestion that "he shall give blessed bread" is a gloss was accepted, and in the light of the interpretation offered here the gloss makes perfect sense coming from a later hand, and is not "irrelevant,"<sup>317</sup> but an attempt to explain the direction. If this translation is accepted, the "emergency" would seem to be not a momentary emergency, but one which goes on for some time. Perhaps a situation of persecution is envisaged, under which circumstances the *oikonomos* might take over the management of the household, and it is even possible that the word "sick" has rendered the Greek *ponoumenoi* (suffering) and that those intended are those suffering under persecution.

Although it is not possible to be certain about the redactional level from which this chapter derives, we can be certain that it is not <sup>R</sup>El due to the assumption herein that the presbyter, rather than the bishop, is the normal liturgical president. <sup>R</sup>CN knew the reality of persecution, and allows a dea-

con to say grace in the absence of a presbyter, but on balance this is more likely to be an ancient direction. It is possible that <sup>R</sup>CN has incorporated it from a source, perhaps understanding it to refer to gifts for the poor.

3–4: See chapter 30 below for details on further provision for widows; it is possible that the chapters are from the same source since both are concerned with charitable provision and with food gifts which are carried away, whilst not fitting comfortably into the surrounding material. For the carrying away of gifts of food see also 28.2 below.<sup>318</sup> The Greek word underlying the Syriac here is probably *apophora*, or perhaps *apophorēton*, which is not the word which stood at 28.2, the work of <sup>R</sup>El. Thus, although the same practice is intended, we may deduce that these chapters are from a different hand. There is nothing here which is typical of <sup>R</sup>CN, though it is possible that he has included this material from a source.

## 25 (Dix 26:18–32): On the bringing in of the lights at the supper of the congregation

<sup>1</sup>When the bishop is present and evening is come the deacon brings in a lamp <sup>2</sup>and standing among all the believers who are present he shall give thanks. Firstly he greets them as he says: “The Lord be with you.”

<sup>3</sup>And the people shall say: “And with your spirit.”

<sup>4</sup>“Let us give thanks to the Lord.”

<sup>5</sup>And they shall say: “It is right and just. Greatness and exaltation with praise is fitting to him.”

<sup>6</sup>And he shall not say “Hearts on high,” for it is to be said at the offering.

<sup>7</sup>And he shall pray in this way as he says: “We give you thanks, O God, through your child Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom you have illuminated us, revealing to us the incorruptible light. <sup>8</sup>Therefore we have completed the length of the day and we have arrived at the beginning

of the night, being sated with the day's light which you created for our satisfaction. And now, having arrived at the light of evening through your grace, we give you praise and glorify you, through your child Jesus Christ, our Lord, through whom to you be power and honor together with the Holy Spirit, now and always and to the ages of ages. Amen."

<sup>10</sup>And all shall say: "Amen."

<sup>11</sup>And then, when they get up after the dinner, they shall pray, and the children and the virgins shall say psalms.

<sup>12</sup>And afterwards the deacon, when he takes the mixed cup of the oblation, shall say one of the psalms in which "alleluia" is written.

<sup>13</sup>After that, if the presbyter has commanded, again from the same psalms. And afterwards, the bishop having offered the cup, he shall say a psalm proper to the cup, while all say "alleluia." <sup>14</sup>And all of them, as he recites the psalms, shall say "alleluia," which is to say "we praise him who is God most high; glorified and praised is he who founded all the world with one word."

<sup>15</sup>And likewise, when the psalm is completed, he shall give thanks over the bread<sup>319</sup> and give of the fragments to all the faithful.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

1–15: With the exception of a few words in verse 8, extant at *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.37.3, this chapter is extant in Ethiopic only. These are not grounds to exclude it, as Easton does, as he himself admits that there is nothing here which necessarily implies that this is an interpolation except for the difficulty of finding its position within the text.<sup>320</sup> There is sufficient of this chapter in *Testamentum Domini* and the *Canons of Hippolytus* to imply that it is original to *Apostolic Tradition*, but as both have thoroughly reworked the material there is nothing in either version which might assist with a reconstruction of the text. There is a gap in the manuscript of the Latin version at this point, but of such a size that this chapter would be accommodated within it.

<sup>13</sup>: The first part of this verse is, as Botte, notes, absolutely obscure in meaning.<sup>321</sup> The translation is simply as literal a rendering of the Ethiopic as is possible in English, with no attempt to find any meaning.

15: Where "bread" is printed, the text reads "cup." Dix persuasively suggests that an error has crept in.<sup>322</sup> The emendation will be justified in the comment below.

## COMMENT

1: Compare Tertullian, *Apology* 39, who, in discussing the Christian suppers known as *agapai*, refers to the entry of lights into the assembly after the washing of hands.

2: Botte notes that there is no change of subject here, but that the speaker is certainly intended to be the bishop.<sup>323</sup> The bringing of lamps would be a task of domestic servants in the ancient world, and so it is performed by the deacon on behalf of the Christian household.

4: The formula "let us bless" (a jussive, as opposed to an imperative) is known within Judaism in domestic settings, but not in the synagogue.<sup>324</sup> According to Heinemann this indicates that the formula dated from a time before the parting of the ways,<sup>325</sup> and its appearance in Christianity may be derived from this domestic Jewish usage.

6: This statement should not be taken, as it is by Jungklaus,<sup>326</sup> as implying that there is a distinction between this meal and the eucharist, for this phrase does not apply to the meal, but to the thanksgiving for the light. It is at the blessing of the lamp that "hearts on high" is not said.

11: See again Tertullian, *Apology* 39, who states that after the lights (presumably he means the kindling of lights), which appears to take place at the conclusion of the meal, "each, as he is able, is called into the middle to sing to God, either from the Scriptures or from his own composition."

Botte states that this verse is "manifestly out of place";<sup>327</sup> whilst correct in noting the dislocation he makes no attempt to explain it. Bradshaw suggests that the translator/redactor was familiar with the same custom of singing after the meal to which Tertullian bears witness, and so explains the interpolation of the phrase "when they get up," with the consequent dislocation of the action described from before the meal to after it.<sup>328</sup> This explanation may be given greater precision, even though it is hard to prove. The hallel psalms, to which reference is made in the following verses, are used in Judaism at the time of drinking the fourth cup with which the Passover seder concludes. The date of the use of these psalms at the seder is debated,

but the addition of the fourth cup certainly took place after the parting of the ways, and may have been added to accompany the psalms.<sup>329</sup> The *Testamentum Domini* locates the ritual described here on the "fifth day of the week of Pascha," namely on the day on which the Passover is commemorated in Syrian paschal rites (roughly equating with Maundy Thursday); it is probable that the Syrian redactors were familiar with contemporary Judaism and possible therefore that they recognized the ritual in this light, so incorporating it into Christian practice in their reworking of this text. It is also probable that the Ethiopic translator was similarly familiar with Judaism and it is moreover possible that the same connection was made, even though it is not made explicit as it is in *Testamentum Domini*. That would in turn explain the dislocation of the singing of psalms and the blessing of the cup to the end of the meal. Singing after supper was not restricted however to religious communities, as it was a common activity in the symposia of the Graeco-Roman world. What leads one to suggest a paschal influence here is the specific reference to "the psalms in which alleluia is written" in the following verse.

That scriptural psalmody was used in the Hippolytean community is clear from the homily on the subject, found in the appendix, though it is suggested below that this passage does not originate in <sup>R</sup>El's community, but that this is P material.

12: The manner in which the deacon is said to "take the cup" may be understood as the deacon's presentation of the offering to the bishop, as described at 4.2 above.

13: On the response of "alleluia" to the psalm sung by the bishop, compare the same procedure described in *Homily on the Psalms*, 4.

14: This translation of "alleluia," different from that offered at *Homily on the Psalms* 4, may well reflect the content of a thanksgiving over the table. Thanksgiving for creation is prominent in table prayers originating in Judaism, and there is a formula markedly similar to this at Mishnah, *Berakoth*, 6.2. For evidence of table prayers giving thanks for creation in Jewish settings prior to the parting of the ways see the *Letter of Aristaeas*, 184–185, *Jubilees* 22:6–9, and Josephus, *Jewish War*, 2.129–131.

15: As noted in the comment on the translation, Dix's suggestion that "bread" should be read here instead of "cup" has been accepted. Cuming's



response is "but this is not a eucharist."<sup>330</sup> That however is to make an assumption; the word "fragments" implies broken bread, the same word is used of this elsewhere in *Apostolic Tradition* at 21.31 and at *Didache* 9, and is in itself sufficient to suggest that there is an error here. As will be noted below in the comment on chapters 25–26, if the emendation is accepted then it is possible to make good sense of the two chapters together. Botte has the same basic understanding of the process being described here,<sup>331</sup> but does not emend the text.

## 26 (Dix 26:1c–4): On the occasion of eating

[<sub>1</sub> When he eats in the company of other believers,] <sub>2</sub> they shall take from the hand of the bishop a single fragment of bread, before anyone breaks the bread which is in front of him. For that is a blessing and not the eucharist, as is the body of the Lord.

<sub>3</sub> (Sahidic version) It is proper that all, before they drink, should take a cup and give thanks over it and in this manner to drink and to eat with purity. Exorcized bread and a cup should be given to catechumens.

<sub>3</sub> (Latin version) . . . to you who are present, and you should feast in this manner. But exorcized bread should be given to catechumens and each should offer a cup.

### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

**Title:** Various editorial titles have been given to this chapter, none with textual support. This title is found in the Sahidic and dependent versions after verse 2 below. Botte translates it as "du temps du repas," and comments that the title does not related to the content of the chapter.<sup>332</sup> Cuming follows this translation and states "This title is quite inappropriate, here or anywhere else,"<sup>333</sup> whereas Jungklaus suggests that it has been removed from its proper position before chapter 25.<sup>334</sup> However, the Coptic word *nau* may render the Greek word *kairos*, as it does at Mark 11:13, and the title may thus be understood as it is translated here.<sup>335</sup> Thus, rather than supply an entirely editorial title, a title has been moved from below in the text.

<sub>1</sub>: This chapter is taken from the Sahidic version. This particular verse, in that version,

followed on from the directions concerning fasting at 23 above, and so there is clearly some redactional activity. One might conjecture an original reading, "When the bishop and the other believers are at supper," though it is perhaps more likely that this verse is a doublet of 25.1, which the Sahidic translator has employed to link this direction to those concerning fasting. For this reason it is enclosed in square brackets. Verse 2 follows on naturally from the last verse of the previous chapter thus:

... he shall give thanks over the bread and give of the fragments to all the faithful. They shall take from the hand of the bishop a single fragment of bread, before anyone breaks the bread which is in front of him.

This is further evidence for the recognition that this verse is an interpolation.

2: The Ethiopic version again has "baked bread." See the discussion of the text and translation of 22:2 above for a suggested explanation. The phrase "as is the body of the Lord" is taken directly from the Sahidic version, though Botte persuasively suggests that an expression such as "antitype" stood here originally.<sup>336</sup>

3: The Latin version picks up again in the middle of this verse. It is apparent that a different grammatical construction underlay the Greek version than exhibited by the Sahidic. The statement that the catechumens "offer" a cup in the Latin version (as opposed to it being offered to them) may be explained as a misunderstanding by the Latin translator of the Greek *prospheeromai*.<sup>337</sup> In the active the word means "offer," which is the manner in which the Latin translator has understood it, whereas in the middle form it would mean "to help oneself." This is the form which probably stood in the Greek text.

2-3: These verses appear duplicated in the Ethiopic version, once at the end of chapter 23 (the position in which they are found in the Sahidic version likewise) and again after chapter 25, which has been relocated within the Ethiopic version. Given the amount of redactional activity which is apparent, and the potentially confusing situation faced by the Ethiopic translator who apparently had divergent texts,<sup>338</sup> the duplication is easily understood, especially since the translator probably had little, if any, idea to what the chapters actually referred.

#### COMMENT

2: The critical question in the interpretation of this verse, which has significant implications for the reading of the chapter overall, is that of determining what is said not to be the eucharist. One understanding would be to refer the statement back to the portions which the bishop distributes.<sup>339</sup> But if that is the case, we should ask why the point is being made that the frag-

ments which the bishop distributes are not the body of the Lord, why this is not given to catechumens, and why it is necessary that the faithful should receive this fragment before eating their own meal. An alternative understanding which obviates these problems is to read the statement as referring to the bread which is "their own"; that is to say, their own meal is not the eucharist. This is blessed, we may assume, by virtue of the saying of grace, but since it is not the body of the Lord it is not to be eaten or broken until the eucharist has first been received. The implication is that the fragments received from the bishop's hand actually are the Body of the Lord. Not only does this interpretation obviate the questions raised, it is more natural in that the demonstrative pronoun *pai* would seem to point to the object nearer in the sentence, namely the bread before the guests, and it is in keeping with the regulations of 36 below that the eucharist should be received at any meal before any other food. The implication of the statement is thus that the sharing of bread which takes place before the meal is indeed eucharistic.

Since the foundational work of Jungklaus, eucharistic content has been denied to this meal and a fellowship meal without eucharistic content has been created out of the material appearing in these chapters.<sup>340</sup> The standard discussion in English is that of Dix.<sup>341</sup> In part this derived from Jungklaus' conviction that the chapters intervening between 23, which concluded with the bishop tasting of the offering which was brought, and this chapter, were not original. This chapter follows chapter 23 in the Sahidic version, and moreover a clause is supplied which bridges the gap between them<sup>342</sup> and gives the impression that an ordinary meal without eucharistic content is intended. As noted above, however, the significant size of the gap in the Latin version indicates that the order here, which is that of Botte, is correct. We may therefore see chapters 25 and 26 in an entirely different context from 23. Botte, however, in spite of his reordering of the chapters, appears to have made no attempt to read this chapters in a different way, and nor has any commentator who has followed him. Chapters 25–26 may, moreover, be read together as the provisions in this verse for the distribution of fragments are expansions of the last sentence of chapter 25. The last chapter concluded with the statement that the bishop should distribute fragments, having given thanks over the cup, and so this chapter describes the same action from the recipients' point of view, directing that they should take the fragments from the bishop's hand and that they should consume them before

consuming their individual portions. When the first verse of this chapter is omitted, as suggested in the discussion of text and translation, this becomes very clear. The text then explains this direction by stating that the diners' individual portions are not eucharistic.

All of which being said, the Hippolytean redactors, like the commentators of the twentieth century, did not recognize the eucharistic content of these chapters since the rites to which they refer were already ancient at the beginning of the third century, and no longer recognizable. In the comment below we expand the argument of the introduction that they derive from an independent source of some antiquity.

3: The direction that each should individually give thanks over a cup is the very direction that is made by Mishnah, *Berakoth* 6.6. Bradshaw regards this direction with suspicion, and argues that it has been added by a redactor to harmonize the practice with that known to him and suggests that it would make more sense were the catechumens alone to offer their own individual cups, which offering would take place in lieu of the common cup which the faithful receive.<sup>343</sup> However, nowhere is it said that the cup over which the president gives thanks is shared. As in Judaism, there is no common cup. Moreover the proximity of these directions to Jewish practice is startling, and a situation in which the president gives thanks over a cup and then, giving thanks, distributes fragments of bread prior to a meal in which individual cups are blessed and drunk and individual portions eaten is entirely feasible.

#### COMMENT ON 25-26

In spite of the confusion deriving from the transmission of these chapters, the possibility of dislocation within them and the necessity of resorting to textual emendation, a pattern may nonetheless be discerned behind them, the pursuance of which has been the object of the comments on individual verses. At the beginning of a meal a light is kindled with accompanying prayer and the offering of a cup is made before the meal by the bishop. After the offering of this cup, bread is distributed by the bishop. After the sharing of bread, individual graces are said over individual cups of wine, which are then consumed. All of this action may be understood as eucharistic action. When the eucharist is concluded the meal begins, as individuals consume their own bread.

The kindling of light followed by the blessing of a cup is familiar ritual from the conclusion to the Jewish context on the occasion of a Sabbath,<sup>344</sup> and the action of individual graces over cups of wine following on is equally familiar from the same context.<sup>345</sup> The clear difference is that the Jewish ritual is domestic whereas this takes place in a church, though the domestic setting of the Roman Christian communities would make a crossover relatively simple.

Although there is no indisputable evidence that this pattern was known before the parting of the ways the very coherence of the pattern found here to that known in Judaism is evidence of some relationship. There is moreover evidence that Roman Christianity in some of its manifestations at least derived from a Jewish milieu. If the Jewish origin of these rituals is accepted then the development of a eucharistic rite within these rituals can be discerned. The cup is offered first, an action which has developed from the *qedusha* of the Sabbath, and is followed by the breaking of bread before the meal proper begins; the eucharistic prayer over the bread would thus have developed from the usual grace at meals, subsequently known as the *birkath hamotsi*. This is not to suggest that this is the sole origin of the eucharist as known in the later church, but that this is the basis on which the eucharist known in this particular Roman community grew up. Interestingly, a similar pattern of development (though without any evidence of prayer at the kindling of lights) is exhibited in the *Didache*, which likewise knows a rite in which the cup is taken first, an act conceivably deriving from the *qedusha*, and in which the prayers over the bread are widely thought to have derived from the *birkath hamazon*.<sup>346</sup>

Whether the Hippolytean school recognized this practice as eucharistic is another question altogether. We shall argue below that chapter 28 is from the hand of <sup>R</sup>El, who is apparently not concerned with a eucharist but with a "private dinner-party."<sup>347</sup> In <sup>R</sup>El's redaction of *Apostolic Tradition*, that chapter follows on from chapters 25–27 in such a way as to indicate that the redactor is adding further directions for the meal which he believes to have been described immediately before. Since it is possible for such a supper to take place with laity alone present, the implication is that <sup>R</sup>El did not recognize a eucharistic rite here, and since <sup>R</sup>El is the first of the Hippolytean redactors, this in turn indicates that these chapters predate the Hippolytean school and are indicative of an ancient eucharistic rite, directly derived from Jewish models, in second-century Rome. There is no single indisputable argument

which necessarily leads to these conclusions, but the coherence which emerges in these chapters when they are read in this light, the accumulation of minor points in its favor and the Jewish parallels to each detail of the practice thus understood mean that the burden of proof must now lie with those who wish to deny any Jewish provenance and eucharistic content.

We have already observed that Jungklaus and Dix did not recognize the presence of any eucharistic practice here; these readings of *Apostolic Tradition* served to establish the consensus. Thus Bradshaw is content to describe the meal here as an *agape*,<sup>348</sup> and Beckwith not only sees no connection between the rites here and eucharistic origins, but sees them rather as the predecessor of the Christian Sunday evening service. He offers no explanation for his suggestion that they had been transferred from the second eve of Sabbath to the evening of Sunday,<sup>349</sup> and then goes on to suggest that when the *agape* was shifted to a weekday, the elements of psalmody alone remained, leaving the origin of the Sunday evening office. Since psalmody would seem to have been a minor element in the "cathedral offices," Beckwith's suggestion cannot be sustained. A more interesting question is that of whether the supper described by Tertullian was eucharistic. It would be hard to be dogmatic on the subject but the probability is that, given its Greek name, it is not an ancient and native African practice, but has been imported from Greek-speaking Christianity and has entered that context without any eucharistic overtone.

## 27 (Dix 26:5–6): That catechumens should not eat with the faithful

*1A catechumen shall not sit at the Lord's Supper. 2But throughout every meal the one who eats should be mindful of the one who invited him; for this reason he was asked to come under the other's roof.*

### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

2: For "the one who eats," the Latin reads "the one who offers." This, like the same phenomenon met in the Latin version at 26.3, can again be explained through a misunderstanding of the middle of *prospheromai* ("eat, help oneself to food") as an active ("offer,")

## COMMENT

1-2: On this chapter Cuming comments that catechumens "may not remain for the eucharist."<sup>350</sup> Jungklaus and Botte interpret the statement in a similar manner.<sup>351</sup> We have already suggested that the eucharist precedes the meal, which makes such an exclusion rather difficult if the catechumens are present for the meal. Rather than implying an exclusion from the premises, these words may be interpreted as suggesting that the catechumens should not sit at the same table as the faithful but that they remain present,<sup>352</sup> just as they pray separately from the faithful at 18.1. Support for this interpretation may be gathered from the practice of Marcionite communities, which probably preserve older practices, in which catechumens are present for the sacramental celebrations.<sup>353</sup> In this respect the catechumens are in an analogous situation to that of freedmen at a meal given by their master who, whilst present, might receive inferior food and seating.<sup>354</sup> The analogous situation provides a social context in which the presence of catechumens might be envisaged at a Christian meal, in an inferior position and not privy to everything that is consumed.

This chapter is probably derived, like the preceding chapters, from P. The common use of the verb *prospheromai* is possible evidence of this. The presence of the catechumens at the eucharist explains why, in chapter 37, it is possible that one who is not of the faithful might receive the eucharistic bread.

2: It is noteworthy that here the invited catechumen is put, by the obligation of gratitude, into the situation of a client invited to participate in his patron's supper. The invitation and the meal would put the client under obligation (thus, at *Epigram* 7.86, Martial complains that Sextus, the patron, "feeds gifts, and not friends," in other words invitations are only given with an eye to what might be had in return).

28 (Dix 26:7-12): That one should eat with understanding and moderation

<sup>1</sup>When you eat and drink, do so with integrity and do not get drunk so that you become ridiculous and cause grief to the one who invites you

through your unruliness, but rather let him give thanks that he is worthy that the saints should come to him. For he said "You are the salt of the earth."

<sup>2</sup>And if a portion is offered to all in common, take from it.

<sup>3</sup>And if you are invited to eat, eat so that you have had just enough, and so that there is food left over, so that the one who invited you might send it out to all who want it as left by the saints, and he may confidently rejoice.

<sup>4</sup>Let those who are invited to eat do so in silence, and not wrangle with words. But when the bishop has exhorted then, if anyone asks anything, he should be answered. And when the bishop is speaking, listen in silence until he is asked again.

<sup>5</sup>And if the faithful are present at supper in the absence of a bishop but a presbyter or deacon is present, let them act in a similarly proper manner. And let everyone be glad to accept a blessed portion from the hand of the presbyter or the deacon. In the same way let a catechumen receive the same, though exorcized. If the laity are present together let them act with understanding. For a layperson cannot give the blessing.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

<sup>2</sup>: The Latin version actually reads: "And if an offering (called in Greek an *apofertum*) is made to all in common, take from it." The note translating the Greek word *apophorēton* would clearly not have stood in the Greek original, indeed it is unlikely that the word *apophorēton* found any place in the Greek original, since it is not transferred to the Sahidic version which speaks of "portions" being given, here retaining the Greek word *meris*. Because a Greek word is retained by the Coptic translator it is likely that this is the word which stood in the original, but that the Latin translator has understood this to be what he knew as an *apophorēton*,<sup>355</sup> and rendered the text accordingly.

<sup>4</sup>: For "listen in silence" the Latin version has "praising in silence"; *audiens* (listening) has been misread as *laudans* (praising).

The understanding of the text presented here is that of Dix, who comments that he is not confident in his reconstruction. The alternative understanding, which is that of Botte, followed by Cuming and Tateo, is:



Let those who are invited to eat do so in silence, and not wrangle in words except as the bishop invites. And if he asks anything he should be answered. And when the bishop is speaking let all be silent until he asks another question.<sup>356</sup>

On balance this is the more likely text were a decision to be based solely on the text as given in the various versions, but it is by no means definitive, as there are uncertainties in all the versions. Much depends on the interpretation of the Greek word *protrepō* which stood in the original and is preserved in the Coptic version. The Latin translator believed that the bishop was to give an exhortation, which was followed by questions, whereas the Coptic translator thinks it is an invitation to ask questions. The word could have either meaning, and the rest follows on from the meaning given to that word.<sup>357</sup> The decision to print the text according to Dix's understanding is based on context and content, rather than on narrowly linguistic grounds, as explained in the comment.

#### COMMENT

2: Whether the Latin or Coptic is followed, the sense is that the person invited should take some of whatever is offered to take away. The giving of an *apophoretum* was an exercise in patronage; thus in Petronius' *Satyricon* 56–57 the giving of an *apophoretum* is an opportunity for the freedman receiving the gift to eulogize Trimalchio, the host, and to discourse on social distinctions. We have already referred to the Roman custom of the *fermentum*, and here, even though the meal described at this point is not a eucharist, we may perhaps perceive the social context in which that practice was able to originate.<sup>358</sup>

3: The custom of wealthy householders sending out food to their *clientela* is very common in Rome; the *sportula*, or small basket, might provide a substitute for the presence of a client at table, and money was often given out instead of food, the monetary grant likewise being known as a *sportula*.<sup>359</sup> Once again this is a means by which the householder is enabled to increase his patronal influence both within and without the church through exercising that function of a wealthy and generous host, though the assumption that food, rather than money, is to be distributed, acts as some check on the largesse of the host, and thus as a control on the power he might exercise.

4: A meal, in the scholastic community represented by *Apostolic Tradition*, would have been an appropriate occasion for moral discourse, as the sym-

potic literature bears witness. However, the whole of this section indicates that there is an attempt to impose episcopal control on the teaching and discourse of the assembly, with the result that the bishop alone might deliver the discourse. We have observed in the discussion on ordination that the strategy of <sup>R</sup>El is to increase the power of the bishop against wealthy patrons and householders on whom the church is economically dependent, and may see this chapter in that same light. The householder is given the opportunity to exercise and reinforce his patronage through the giving of the meal, through the giving of *apophoreta* and through the ability to hand out leftovers, but the bishop is given the monopoly in his particular function of teaching. The questioning is more reasonably seen as being put to the bishop on the basis of his discourse than in being a simple question and answer session. This would be in keeping with the common custom of early Christianity to test any message which is given. In a Roman scholastic context however it is particularly reminiscent of the eleventh *Mandate* of Hermas, which speaks of a false prophet sat on a chair (which was the normal place of a teacher) who spoke in response to questions from his audience.

5: There is a shift in emphasis in the second part of this verse from conversation to a concern that the food be properly blessed, and the understanding in question is no longer that of the spiritual nature of the discourse at the table, but that a layperson should understand their lack of competence to bless bread. This is less a concern for proper sacramental causality than a concern for control. It is noteworthy that presbyters and deacons are given the power of presidency otherwise assumed to be the preserve of the bishop. Thus in the first part of the verse it is possible to interpret the statement that there should be proper behavior as enjoining silence in the absence of a bishop, whereas the second assumes that a presbyter or deacon may likewise preside. In view of the manner in which <sup>R</sup>El is concerned to bolster the power of the bishop over the presbyters, who are not distinct from the patrons, it is possible that the glossing in this verse is the work of <sup>R</sup>CN, in whose community the presbyters were not powerful patrons but teachers in communion with the bishop.

1–5: This chapter, fundamentally the work of <sup>R</sup>El, is a good illustration of the manner in which, whilst maintaining the social structures of patronage, the church is re-aligning them, in particular by bringing them under episcopal control. The result is that the church can continue to benefit from patron-

age whilst debilitating patronal power and influence through emphasis on the role of bishop as teacher.<sup>360</sup>

### 29 (Dix: 26.13): That one should eat with thanksgiving<sup>361</sup>

*Let everyone eat in the name of the Lord. We should compete among the heathen in being like-minded and sober, for this is what pleases God.*

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

The Sahidic version states at the beginning, "let everyone eat with thanksgiving in the name of the Lord." Botte suggests that it is an explanatory gloss.<sup>362</sup> This in turn casts doubt on the Sahidic title. There are other divergences between the traditions, but Botte is able satisfactorily to explain them all,<sup>363</sup> and thus to demonstrate the accuracy of the Latin version.

#### COMMENT

Tertullian likewise compares the sobriety and harmony of Christian suppers to what he characterizes as the drunkenness and lawlessness of their pagan equivalents.<sup>364</sup>

### 30 (Dix 27): On supper for widows

*If anyone wishes that widows, who should have attained seniority in age, should have a supper, he should send them home before evening. If, however, he is unable because of the lot which has fallen to him, he should give them food and wine and send them away so that they can partake of the gifts at home when it suits them.*

#### COMMENT

*Apostolic Tradition* does not envisage the phenomenon of the wealthy and

powerful widow; widows might be left as beneficiaries of their husband's will, or might receive an usufruct of the estate, but, except in the very rare circumstances (by the third century) that at marriage she had entered into the *manus* of her husband, unless specific provision was made for a widow in her husband's will, a widow might be thrust into penury.<sup>365</sup> The discussion on the appointment of widows at chapter 10 above implies that a widow is appointed on grounds of poverty (she has no *leitourgia*, that is to say she is not in a position to offer patronage) and the widows envisaged in this chapter are those so appointed, who therefore qualify for the patronage of the church. It is interesting that the patronage so much imitates the pattern of wider society that a gift of food may substitute for actual presence at a dinner.<sup>366</sup>

This passage connects closely with 24.3–4 above. It was suggested there that <sup>R</sup>CN had included that material from a source. We may now follow up on that argument. In the first place we may suggest that neither chapter derives from P, as chapter 32 follows neatly from the P chapters 25–27, which would mean that this chapter, and chapter 31, disrupted that block of material. On the other hand we have already observed linguistic reasons why 24.3–4 does not derive from <sup>R</sup>El. This means that 24.3–4 and this chapter derive from a single source document other than P and have been incorporated by one of the two redactors. Whereas it is possible that this incorporation is the work of <sup>R</sup>El, there is no clear reason why he should do this. However, the Roman church in the third century had an organized system of poor relief;<sup>367</sup> even if it was not the basis for the establishment of a mon-episcopate at Rome, as Lampe suggested,<sup>368</sup> it was nonetheless a significant element in the life of the centralized Roman congregations, and so a concern for this aspect of the church's life is more likely to be exhibited by <sup>R</sup>CN,

31 (Dix 28.1–5): On the fruits which it is right to offer to the bishop<sup>369</sup>

*1 Let all hasten to offer the new fruits of the harvest to the bishop as first-fruits. 2 And as he offers them, he shall bless them and name the one who offered saying:*

<sup>3</sup>We give thanks to you, O God, and we offer you the firstlings of the fruits you have granted us to receive; through your Word you nourished them, ordering the earth to bring forth all fruits for the enjoyment and nourishment of people and for all animals. <sup>4</sup>We praise you, O God, for all these things and in all the things in which you have assisted us, for us adorning the whole creation with various fruits; <sup>5</sup>through your child Jesus Christ Our Lord, through whom be glory to you for the ages of ages.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

1: The Latin version's clumsy attempt to translate "first-fruits" reduces the text to incomprehensibility, but the Sahidic version is clear, and much of the Greek may be discerned behind it.

3-5: A Greek version of this prayer is extant in a number of manuscripts.<sup>370</sup>

#### COMMENT

2: The naming of one making an offering in the prayer is certainly a Roman custom, a relic of which survives in the Roman canon.<sup>371</sup> Curiously, there is no room in the prayer which follows to name the donor, which makes the collection of material here suspect.

### 32 (Dix 28.6-8): On the blessing of fruits

<sup>1</sup>Fruits are indeed blessed, that is, grapes, figs, pomegranates, olives, pears, apples, mulberries, peaches, cherries, almonds, plums; but not leeks, pumpkins, melons, cucumbers, onions, garlic, or any other vegetable.

<sup>2</sup>But sometimes flowers are also offered. So let the rose and the lily be offered, but no other.

<sup>3</sup>And in all things which are eaten they shall give thanks to the holy God, eating to his glory.

## TEXT AND TRANSLATION

1: The Latin version omits leeks at the beginning of the list of forbidden fruits and vegetables. This word is included from the Sahidic version in order to bring the list more closely into line with that of Numbers 11:5 (on which see the comment below).

2: The Latin version has a space for a title before this verse.

## COMMENT

1: It is hard to discern the basis behind the particular fruits which are to be offered for blessing and those to be refused. Cuming notes that a number of these fruits are subject to tithing,<sup>372</sup> but the Mishnaic parallel he notes is hardly relevant, as foods in the forbidden category here are also subject to tithing and since, as will be noted below, the original context of this list was not that of offering. A more convincing rabbinic parallel is, however, pointed out by McGowan who shows a degree of similarity between this list and that of the "foods of Israel" found in certain rabbinic writings.<sup>373</sup> The most striking difference between the two lists is the absence of wheat and barley, which head up the rabbinic list, though this will be explained below. The observation of a similarity between these fruits and those of Israel is the beginning of an explanation, and it may be noted that in the Talmud these fruits are singled out for blessing,<sup>374</sup> but the similarity is not self-explanatory.

The objection to certain kinds of fruit and vegetable is also puzzling. There is no social basis on which the distinction is made, for whereas leeks were much favored by Nero, among others, and were a vegetable used by persons of high social standing, and cucumbers had similar status, even though Augustus' consumption of cucumber is told by Suetonius as an indication of his simplicity,<sup>375</sup> onions were used by people of low status.<sup>376</sup> Bauer and Cuming however note that the list is similar to that of vegetables and fruits enjoyed in Egypt, the absence of which the Israelites bemoaned at Numbers 11:5,<sup>377</sup> especially if the reading of the Sahidic version is accepted, in which leeks head the list. The mention of pumpkins is an addition to the list from Numbers, which is also found in the Sahidic version, but since the word translated "melon," *melopepo*, was a particular kind of melon, described by Pliny as a new introduction to Italy,<sup>378</sup> the introduction of pumpkins into the list may then have been occasioned by confusion between melons and pumpkins. However, once again, this observation does not of itself explain the direction here.

An explanation which answers all the questions posed is, however, hinted at by McGowan who suggests that the instructions of this chapter originally related to a cultic meal.<sup>379</sup> If he is correct then not only does this explain the proximity to Jewish practice with regard to blessings, but explains the failure to mention wheat and barley in the list of preferred foods, because bread is taken for granted as always being employed, and further explains the exclusion of the foods of Egypt, which are tainted from being foods suitable for offering to God in a meal in which the "bread from Heaven in Jesus Christ" had a privileged place. A number of the fruits which are to be consumed are given symbolic explanations by <sup>R</sup>CN in the *Commentary on Canticles*, which point to the presence of Christ;<sup>380</sup> these may be traditional, deriving from the consumption of these fruits in the sacred meals of the Hippolytean community.

2: Easton suggests that *Canticles* 2:1 is the basis for the privileged status of the rose and the lily.<sup>381</sup> Bauer notes a number of scriptural references to roses as to lilies, and we may note a classical parallel in that Pliny states that the lily is second in nobility only to the rose,<sup>382</sup> but Easton's suggestion is to be favored given that this chapter in *Canticles* states that these flowers have entered into the banqueting hall, a direct link to the use of flowers envisaged here. It may be noted that the supply of flowers as decoration for banquets was commonplace in the Roman world, but might be an opportunity for a display of ostentation even more than the supply of food;<sup>383</sup> this regulation may well reflect an attempt to restrict such ostentation in Christian communities.

Chapters 31–32: We noted above the inconsistency between the rubric which allowed for the prayer to make mention of the person making the offering, and the prayer itself, in which there was no place for such a mention to be made. We may further note here the inconsistency noted by McGowan that the prayer shows no sign of excluding any fruit or vegetable from the scope of thanksgiving.<sup>384</sup> These may be explained through McGowan's observation that chapter 32 referred originally to a sacred meal, and is traditional. We may suggest that this traditional material has been taken and re-employed. We may further suggest that this reworking and re-employment is the work of <sup>R</sup>EL, for it is easy to suggest a reason why he should turn P's further directions concerning sacred meals into an offering to the bishop, in that the offering of first-fruits in the Old Testament was made to the high

priest. <sup>8</sup>El's reworking of this material may therefore be seen as part of his strategy of "sacerdotalizing" the episcopate, in order to give it the social standing over the patron-presbyters which it otherwise would lack. Thus we suggest that chapter 32, which is concerned with the foodstuffs suitable for a festal meal, derived from P, and that chapter 31, which turns the chapters into a discussion of offering to the bishop and seems indiscriminate in what foods might be offered, derives from <sup>8</sup>El. The failure of the prayer to mention the donor is puzzling; however, Easton points out that the prayer is close to Jewish models.<sup>385</sup> We may suggest in turn then that, just as <sup>8</sup>CN employed traditional material in his construction of the prayer over the oil in chapter 5 above, so <sup>8</sup>El has likewise employed traditional material in his construction of this prayer.

### 33 (Dix 29): That nobody should touch any food at the Pascha before the proper time

*1At the Pascha, nobody may eat before the offering is made. For if anyone acts thus it is not reckoned to him as fasting.*

*2If anyone is pregnant or sick, and cannot fast for two days, they should fast on the Saturday on account of their necessity, confining themselves to bread and water.*

*3But if anyone was on a boat or, through the circumstance of some other necessity, did not know the day, when he has learned it should keep the fast after the Pentecost. 4For the Pascha which we keep is not the type, for the type has passed away, for which reason it ended in the second month. And we should keep the fast when we have learnt the truth.*

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

2: An alternative translation might be: "they should fast on the Saturday, if necessary taking bread and water." This is the interpretation favored by Dix.<sup>386</sup> Bread and water, as elements in a paschal fast, are found in the Syrian *Didascalia*,<sup>387</sup> and for this reason the translation offered above is preferred. According to this understanding, bread and water constitute the fast, rather than being allowable exceptions.



4: The first clause of this verse is missing in the Latin version, and is supplied from the Sahidic text, in accordance with the understanding which Botte puts upon it.<sup>388</sup>

## COMMENT

3: We should be clear that Pentecost is simply the fiftieth day after Pascha, and is not a feast in its own right at this time.<sup>389</sup>

4: Botte suggests that the point being made is that the Jewish Pascha, which concluded in the second month, after fifty days, comes to a conclusion, whereas the Christian Pascha does not.<sup>390</sup> This is hardly likely to be the correct interpretation, for not only does the Christian Pascha come to an end just as the Jewish, it does not explain why fasting should therefore take place after fifty days, nor is it sensitive to the common Christian language of the typology of Pascha. The type has passed away, not because it concludes after fifty days but because the truth, that is to say the true Pascha, has taken its place; in this sense the Jewish Pascha has come to its conclusion, in that it has outlived its usefulness and been overtaken by the Christian Pascha. In line with this, an interpretation of this passage is proposed in the comment below.

1-4: *Apostolic Tradition* states that the type has passed away, that is to say the Jewish Passover is now vacuous of significance. But some Christians continued to keep the Pascha at the same time as the Jews. Known as Quartodecimans, they either kept a paschal celebration at precisely the same time as the Jews, in the early evening of 14th-15th Nisan, or else postponed the celebration until later in the night, until after midnight, by which time the Jewish festivities had concluded. A dispute between these two groups explains the first part of this chapter. In stating that nobody should eat before the time of the offering, it is stating that the Pascha should not be kept early in the evening at the same time as the Jews but that Christians should wait until the proper time for the celebration. The explanation occurs in the first part of the fourth verse, for to keep Pascha at the same time as the Jews is to keep the type. I have argued elsewhere that <sup>R</sup>El was a Quartodeciman who kept Pascha later in the Paschal night<sup>391</sup> and so these verses may be ascribed to that redactor.

However, both kinds of Quartodeciman practice became controversial at Rome late in the second century, as the differing paschal practices of the

different congregations, and in particular the Quartodeciman practice of the Asian churches, were perceived as obstacles to unity. Part of the understanding which was reached between the Hippolytean community and the wider Roman church under <sup>R</sup>CN was a settlement of this dispute, by which the Pascha was always kept on the Sunday after the occurrence of the Jewish Pascha. A record of this is found in the paschal tables on the statue. This settlement has clearly happened by the time of the redaction of the second verse of this chapter, which effectively qualifies and alters the sense of the first as it makes explicit reference to Saturday as a day of compulsory fasting.

The third verse is a reworking of a regulation from Numbers 9:9–12, which directed that one who was unable to keep the Passover through absence on a journey or ritual uncleanness should keep the Passover on the fourteenth day of the second month, rather than the fourteenth of Nisan, which was the first month. Because fasting might not take place in the fifty days, *Apostolic Tradition* states that the fast should be kept not in the second month, which would fall within the fifty days, but at the conclusion of the Pentecost.<sup>392</sup> This level of redaction also qualifies the original explanation concerning the type by suggesting that the Jewish type came to an end “because it concluded in the second month.” It actually did no such thing, but the thought which brings about this assertion may be understood with reference to a Hippolytean fragment cited in Theodoret’s *Eranistes*, which states that the fifty days prefigure the Kingdom of Heaven.<sup>393</sup> <sup>R</sup>CN, to whom this verse must be assigned because of the manner in which it has amended a Quartodeciman statement, is rather cryptically suggesting that the Kingdom of Heaven is eternal, by contrast to the temporary provision of the Jewish pentecost, and for that reason no fasting might take place within the fifty days. It is interesting to note that, with the move of Pascha to a Sunday, Pascha is defined more by the preliminary fast than by the celebration which uniquely marked that festival in Quartodeciman communities.

### 34 (Dix 30): That it is proper for deacons to attend on the bishop

*Each deacon should wait upon the bishop with the subdeacons. It should be told him if any is sick so that, if it please the bishop, he may*

*visit them. For a sick person is encouraged indeed when the chief of the priests remembers him.*

## COMMENT

Observe what is said of deacons and their duties with regard to the bishop at chapter 8 above.

It is not clear whether it is the bishop who is to visit the sick,<sup>394</sup> or the deacon on the bishop's behalf. Nor is the purpose of the visitation clear; it is possible that, in keeping with 24.3–4 above, food is being sent, which would conform to the deacon's duties and explain the place of this instruction at the conclusion of other instructions concerning meals and eating. Otherwise the purpose of the visit may be consolation, a common purpose in the visiting of the sick in imperial Rome,<sup>395</sup> which would be indicated by the word translated "encouraged."<sup>396</sup>

It is to be noted that the visiting of the sick was a duty of the network of patronage known as *amicitia* (friendship) alongside other social calls which are made from duty, and this might be the context in which the visiting is envisaged. Although the calling was normally the duty of a client, visiting might also take place among equals, and superiors might visit inferiors in time of sickness as a means of strengthening bonds of *amicitia*,<sup>397</sup> or with the motive of ensuring that they are remembered by the sick person with a legacy.<sup>398</sup> This need not mean that the bishop visited the sick in person, for the duty might be delegated to a deacon, as emperors certainly generally visited the sick by proxy.<sup>399</sup> In either event we should understand that, with this direction, <sup>R</sup>El, who may confidently be stated to be the author of this chapter on the basis of the language of high-priesthood applied to the bishop here, is establishing the social activities of patronage within the church and thus anchoring the position of the bishop as one who participates in these activities. Here, as in the directions given for the employment of patronage at meals, the social world of Rome is mirrored in the church, whilst being to an extent subverted, as the principal patron, the bishop has his position on the basis of education rather than wealth or social status.

35 (Dix 31): On the time when it is proper to pray<sup>400</sup>

*1 The faithful, as soon as they have woken and got up, before they go to their work, shall pray to God and then hasten to their work. 2 If there is any instruction in the word, he should give priority to this and go to hear the word of God, for the strengthening of his soul. He should hurry to the assembly where the Spirit abounds.*

## COMMENT

The scholastic orientation of the Hippolytean community is clearly demonstrated in the preference over prayer given to the study of the word of God. Significantly the language of prophecy appears here, in that the word translated "strengthening" (*parakalein*) was the word which intended prophecy, and the assembly is said to be the place where the Spirit abounds. Judging from his *Homily on the Psalms*,<sup>8</sup> El, from whom this passage derives, had a generally positive attitude toward the practice of prophecy in the church, though one may perhaps doubt the extent to which it was a live phenomenon in his community. The rhetorical strategy of this chapter is to adopt the language of prophecy and to apply it to teaching activity.

## 36 (Dix 32.1): That it is proper to partake of the eucharist first, whenever it is offered, before anything else is consumed

*Every faithful one should be concerned that, before he consumes anything else, he partake in the eucharist. For if he partakes in faith, even if anything deadly is given him, after that it shall not overcome him.*

## TEXT AND TRANSLATION

This chapter is translated from the Greek version extant in the "Ochrid fragment."<sup>401</sup> The text was communicated to Botte by Richard, its editor.

## COMMENT

This chapter might appear to be early evidence for eucharistic fasting. We shall observe in the comment on chapters 36–38 below that this is not the original context of this direction but that in origin this was a direction that, when the eucharist was celebrated in the context of a meal, the eucharistic species should be consumed before the meal. However, we shall also observe that in its current context it regulates the reception of communion at home. That this was received as the first food of the day is also stated by Tertullian.<sup>402</sup> Thus, despite the very proper denial of Frochisse that this passage is a witness to eucharistic fasting,<sup>403</sup> we may suggest that there is nonetheless a relationship, and we may thus begin to formulate a thesis concerning the origin of the eucharistic fast, namely that because the eucharist was received before food when the celebration took place in the context of a meal, it kept that character when the celebration moved to the morning, in part because a pattern of fasting reception already existed with regard to the reception of the eucharist at home.

37 (Dix 32.2): That it is proper to guard the eucharist carefully

*Everybody should be concerned that one who is not of the faithful, nor a mouse nor any other animal, should eat of the eucharist, and that none of it should fall and be altogether lost. For it is the body of Christ to be eaten by the faithful, and not to be despised.*

38 (Dix 32.3–4): That it is improper that anything should be allowed to fall from the cup

*1For, blessing the cup in the name of God, you received, as it were, the antitype of the blood of Christ. 2For this reason do not pour it out, that no alien spirit might lick it up because you despised it; you shall be*

*guilty of the blood, like one who despises the price with which he has been bought.*

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

2: Dix reads "you shall be guilty of the blood of Christ." Although there is support for this reading in the oriental versions, they are so expanded at this point as to be very unreliable.

#### COMMENT

1: On the language of antitype see 21.27.

36–38: These chapters are considered inauthentic by Jungklaus and Easton on the grounds of their position in the text.<sup>404</sup> As was noted in the introduction, there are two endings to *Apostolic Tradition*. As was further noted there, these chapters appear in the version with the shorter ending, which we have attributed to the redactional work of <sup>R</sup>EI, but no longer appear in the version which <sup>R</sup>CN produced. Easton argued that, since the longer ending was authentic (on the grounds that the chapter on the cemetery was clearly Roman)<sup>405</sup> these chapters could not be authentic, whereas Jungklaus reckoned all the material unique to one or the other conclusion inauthentic. The alternative, Easton suggests, was that Hippolytus had produced two separate versions of *Apostolic Tradition*, which was clearly improbable; Jungklaus equally was attempting to avoid the implication that there might be two recensions of the same document. The solution to the problem of the duplicate conclusions proposed in the introduction means that such an issue disappears, because two endings were indeed produced within the Hippolytean school.

Dix, however, defended the authenticity of these chapters, whilst recognizing the awkwardness of their placement, on the grounds of their apparent third-century character, (which Easton had himself recognized), and by further pointing out that the chapters are cited by Jerome as by Hippolytus.<sup>406</sup>

Both Easton and Dix refer to Connolly's suggestion that the chapters refer to individual communication from the Sacrament reserved in the home,<sup>407</sup> a practice to which Tertullian bears witness.<sup>408</sup> Connolly came to this conclusion on the basis that the instructions are addressed not to clergy,

who would have care of the consecrated elements in the church, but to the faithful. Connolly however had thought that chapter 38 nonetheless referred to a celebration in a church, because reservation of a chalice was unknown in antiquity. Easton is likewise puzzled by this chapter, and particularly by the statement that the wine is an antitype once a blessing is said over it by the same person who receives it, a statement which would be odd were the chapter referring to the conduct of laypersons.<sup>409</sup> Dix nonetheless suggests that this might have been the usual manner of receiving the chalice at home in the Roman church, and points to the practice of the (then) Roman rite of the mass of the presanctified on Good Friday, in which an unconsecrated chalice is consumed after intinction with a consecrated host.<sup>410</sup> He suggests that this custom was unknown elsewhere, though a similar practice is also known in Syria.<sup>411</sup>

An alternative explanation of these chapters is nonetheless possible, namely that they regulate conduct at the meal accompanying the Lord's supper. According to this reading, chapter 36 dictates that the eucharist should be received at the very beginning of the meal, rather than at the beginning of the day; the noxious substance which might then be eaten would be one served at the same meal. Chapter 37 is then concerned with the treatment of the eucharistic species in the context of a meal, at which catechumens would be present and who must be prevented from receiving the eucharistic species.<sup>412</sup> Chapter 38, with its strange instruction that the cup should not be poured out, rather than concerning spillage,<sup>413</sup> prevents the pouring of the eucharistic cup in a libation; it is as a libation that the cup might be taken up by alien spirits. The reference to the individual blessing of the cup in this chapter may be explained with reference to 26.2, which anticipates that individuals say their own blessing over the cup in keeping with Jewish practice. This understanding of these chapters thus not only explains the address to the individual faithful, but also explains the oddities in the rationale for the fast and the strange instruction preventing the deliberate pouring out of the cup.

If this is the correct understanding of these chapters, we should nonetheless note that in its current context, following on from instructions about prayer in the morning, it appears to apply to private communion from the reservation at home as Connolly and Dix suggested. However, one must reckon with the possibility that this instruction derives from P, and that it originally dealt with conduct at meals within the community, but that

it has been placed after the instructions concerning prayer by <sup>R</sup>El in order that it might serve to regulate private communion at home. As was noted in the introduction, in P these instructions would readily find a place at the conclusion of the other material regulating meals, as everything between the descriptions of meals and this regulation has been inserted by <sup>R</sup>El. This is the reason why its ritual (particularly in anticipating that individuals say a blessing over their own cups) is even more primitive than that known to <sup>R</sup>El, but conforms perfectly to that of P. There is other linkage, beyond the literary suitability of these chapters following chapter 32, in that not only is it assumed that individuals give thanks over their own cups, but the cup moreover is described as an antitype, as it is at 21.27.

#### 42A<sup>414</sup>

*1If you are tempted, reverently sign yourself on the forehead. For this sign of the passion is displayed against the Devil, if it is made in faith and not to please people, but through knowledge, putting it forward like a breastplate. 2For if the Adversary sees the power of the Spirit (from the heart) being outwardly demonstrated in the likeness of baptism, he will flee away trembling, not because you spat on him but because you breathed on him. 3This is what Moses did in a type with the sheep which was sacrificed on the Passover. Sprinkling the blood on the lintel and anointing the two doorposts he signified that faith in the perfect sheep which is now in us. 4By signing forehead and eyes with the hand we shall escape the one who is seeking our destruction.*

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

1: Instead of "If you are tempted" the Latin version has "always try." Botte suggests that *ei* (if) was misread as *aei* (always) with the consequent alteration of *peirazēi* (a subjunctive forming the conditional clause) for *peiraze* (an imperative).<sup>415</sup>

2: For "spat on him" the Latin has "struck him." I suspect a misreading of the Greek *ptuontos* (spitting) as *tuptontos*, (striking), by a scribe who had no comprehension of the rite of spitting. See further the comment on 41:13–14 and the discussion of the text and translation of 43B:3.



## COMMENT

1: Tertullian tells us that African Christians, a time roughly contemporary with this writing, made "the sign" on every occasion in their daily activity.<sup>416</sup>

3: Dix notes the parallel to the use of Moses' smearing of the doorposts and lintel with blood as signifying post-baptismal anointing which occurs in the second-century Asian homily *On the Holy Pascha* which, at the time at which Dix wrote, was attributed to Hippolytus.<sup>417</sup> He suggests in this light that the image was the creation of Hippolytus. The image is hinted at, however, in Melito of Sardis *On Pascha*, which had not been discovered when Dix wrote. In the light of these subsequent discoveries we may suggest that it is a common image in Quartodeciman circles. Its use here tends to confirm <sup>R</sup>El's Quartodeciman Asian background. Melito has a similar view of the apotropaic effect of the blood of the sheep.

## 43A (Dix 38.1–2)

*1When these things are heard with thanksgiving and with orthodox belief, they provide upbuilding to the church and eternal life to those who believe. 2I advise you who are truly understanding to observe them. For to all who hear the apostolic tradition . . .*

## TEXT AND TRANSLATION

1: For "orthodox" the Latin version has "rightly glorious." The Greek word "orthodox" has been misunderstood.

2: At this point the Latin manuscript breaks off again.

## COMMENT

43A: This is <sup>R</sup>El's conclusion in place. The fuller version which is found in the Sahidic text, which is a translation of <sup>R</sup>CN's text, is found below at the conclusion of <sup>R</sup>CN's work, though the whole probably derives from <sup>R</sup>El. See the comment there.

39 (Dix 33)<sup>418</sup>

*1 The deacons and the presbyters should gather daily at the place which the bishop appoints for them. Let the deacons not fail to assemble at all times, unless illness prevents them. 2 When all have gathered together, they should teach those who are in the church, and in this way, when they have prayed, each should go to the task which falls to him.*

## TEXT AND TRANSLATION

1–2: This chapter is taken from the Sahidic version. For its position in that version see the introduction.

1: Botte suggests that there may be some corruption in the words “at all times,” which seem to make little sense here.<sup>419</sup>

## COMMENT

The question which naturally arises is why the deacons are singled out. Dix entitles this chapter “daily chapter of the clergy,”<sup>420</sup> which assumes that the clergy are all to gather in one place. However, it is possible that this applies only to the deacons, who are to gather with the bishop, whereas the intention is that the presbyters assemble in their respective churches, where they undertake the teaching described in the second verse. A preposition *ehoun* (together) is added after the second appearance of the verb, which indicates that a secondary process, the gathering of the congregations in the churches, is intended. This would explain the apparent absence of the bishop.<sup>421</sup> If this is the correct understanding of the chapter then it certainly derives from <sup>R</sup>CN.

The daily teaching activity is the same as that discussed in 35 above and 41 below. Bradshaw further suggests that this is related to the teaching of the catechumens.<sup>422</sup> It is possible that there is a relationship, but the relationship derives from the more fundamental scholastic orientation of the Hippolytean community. Bradshaw also observes that a similar institution of daily assembly for instruction is known to Origen;<sup>423</sup> we may add to this observation that a similarly orientated church employed Origen as teacher, and ordained him as presbyter.

## 40 (Dix 34): On the cemeteries

<sup>1</sup>No man may be heavily charged for burying a man in the cemeteries, for it is the property of all the poor. Except the fee of the workman should be paid to him who digs and the price of the tiles be given. <sup>2</sup>The bishop should provide for those who are in that place from that which is offered to the church and look after it, so that there may be no heavy charge for those who come to those places.

## TEXT AND TRANSLATION

2: Because both the Arabic/Ethiopic versions and *Testamentum Domini* specify that the bishop's provision should be made from the church's funds, the phrase is included here, rendered from the Ethiopic, with an eye on *Testamentum Domini*, even though no phrase of this nature appears in the Sahidic version. The independent appearance of that provision in two versions is evidence that such a statement appeared in the original.<sup>424</sup>

## COMMENT

1: Connolly explains that the tiles are those used in the catacombs to seal up the *loculi*, the horizontal chambers in which the bodies are placed.<sup>425</sup> They would have to be purchased from a builder's merchant, and hence their price is to be refunded. The versions adapt this provision freely to their local conditions, and the appropriateness of the direction here to a Roman setting was employed by Connolly as evidence for its Roman origin, and for the Hippolytean authorship of *Apostolic Tradition*.

1–2: Dix delights in pointing out that Callistus was responsible for the management of the first cemetery to come into the possession of the Roman congregation, and suggests that this chapter hints that something is amiss in its management.<sup>426</sup> Earlier Christians had been buried in private family burial plots, perhaps as an extension of the right of clients to be buried in the plots of their patrons. The first cemetery, previously a private burial ground, came into the collective possession of the Roman churches at around the end of the second century, a time in which the church is beginning to consolidate its central functions, and is in a position to hold collective property. Callistus was its first administrator. Throughout the third

century the number of cemeteries belonging to the Roman church increased.<sup>427</sup> The provision of this chapter must come from a time in which the bishop has management of a cemetery, and on the basis that the bishop is in communion with the Hippolytean community, which now has access to the cemetery, it is the work of <sup>R</sup>CN. To understand the chapter as referring to the common cemetery under the administration of Callistus, as Dix does, is to misunderstand the relationship between the Hippolytean community at the time of <sup>R</sup>El and the wider Roman church.

#### 41 (Dix 35–36): On the time when it is proper to pray

*1Every faithful man and woman, when they have risen from sleep in the morning, before they touch any work at all, should wash their hands and pray to God, and so go to their work. 2But if instruction in the word of God takes place, each one should choose to go to that place, reckoning in his heart that it is God whom he hears in the one who instructs. For he who prays in the church will be able to pass by the wickedness of the day. He who is God-fearing should think it a great loss if he does not go to the place where instruction is given, and especially if he can read, or if a teacher comes. 3Let none of you be late in the church, the place where teaching is given. Then it shall be given to the speaker to say things profitable to all, and you will hear things of which you would not think, and profit from things which the Holy Spirit will give you through the one who instructs. In this way your faith will be strengthened in regard to matters about which you heard. What you ought to do in your house will also be told in that place. Therefore let everyone hurry in coming to the assembly, the place where the Holy Spirit abounds. 4And if there is a day on which there is no instruction, and each one is in the house, he should take a holy book and read in it as much as seems profitable.*

*5And if indeed you are in the house, pray at the third hour and praise God. But if you are elsewhere and the occasion comes about, pray in*

your heart to God. <sup>6</sup>For at that hour Christ was displayed nailed to the tree. For this reason also in the Old Testament, the Law prescribed that the shewbread should be offered at every hour as a type of the Body and Blood of Christ; and the slaughter of the speechless lamb is this, a type of the perfect lamb. For the shepherd is Christ, and also the bread which came down from heaven. <sup>7</sup>Pray likewise at the time of the sixth hour. For as Christ was fixed on the wood of the cross that day was divided, and a great darkness descended. Therefore they should pray a powerful prayer at that hour, imitating the voice of him who prayed and darkened the whole creation on account of the unbelieving Jews. <sup>8</sup>And they should pray at the ninth hour also a great prayer and give great praise, following the manner in which the soul of the righteous praises the Lord, the God of truth, who remembered his saints and sent them his Son, that is his Word, to enlighten them. <sup>9</sup>For at that hour Christ, pierced in the side, poured forth water and blood and lit up the rest of that day and brought it so to the evening. Hence, in beginning to sleep, he made it the beginning of another day which fulfilled the image of resurrection. <sup>10</sup>Pray also before your body rests on the bed. <sup>11</sup>Rising around midnight wash your hands with water, and pray. <sup>12</sup>And if you have a wife, pray both together; if she is not yet among the faithful, take yourself into another room and pray, and go back to bed again. Do not be dilatory about praying. <sup>13</sup>[He who is bound in the marriage bond is not defiled. Those who have washed have no need of washing again for they are clean. <sup>14</sup>Through signing yourself with moist breath, caught as spittle in your hand, your body is purified all the way to your feet. For when (prayer) is offered with a believing heart, the gift of the Spirit and the pouring of baptism sanctify the one who believes, as though from the font.] <sup>15</sup>For this reason it is necessary to pray at this hour, for those elders who handed on the tradition taught us to do so because at that hour all creation is still for a moment to praise the Lord. Stars and trees and waters stop for an instant, and all the host of the angels which ministers to him praises God at this hour with the souls of the just. <sup>16</sup>This is why believers should take good care to pray at this hour. Bearing witness to this matter also the Lord says thus: "Behold, a shout went up

around the middle of the night, of people saying: 'Look, the bridegroom is coming: get up to meet him.' And he goes on saying: "Therefore be watchful, for you do not know at what hour he comes."<sup>17</sup> And likewise pray, getting up around cock-crow. For at the hour when the cock crew the sons of Israel denied Christ, whom we have known by faith, looking each day in hope for the appearing of eternal light at the resurrection of the dead.<sup>18</sup> Therefore if you faithful act thus and keep them in your memory and teach them in turn and encourage the catechumens, you shall not undergo temptation, nor will you perish, for you shall have Christ always in mind.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

2: For "If instruction in the word of God takes place" the Sahidic version has "If instruction takes place and the word of God takes place." The emendation is based on a passage in *Apostolic Constitutions* and is adopted following Botte.<sup>428</sup>

Dix concludes this verse with "especially if he can read," and takes the following clause with the next verse. This is a possible reading of the Coptic, and that which was adopted by the Ethiopic translator but, as Leipoldt points out,<sup>429</sup> it does not account for the word "or."

4: For "in the house" the Sahidic version has "in his house." Since it seems improbable that many people would possess books, it is suggested that the house is that in which the church gathers, where a library might be retained as a common possession.

5: For "in the house" the Sahidic version has "in your house." The rationale for alteration is less compelling than in the previous verse, but is made in the interest of consistency.

6: For "at every hour" (the reading of the Sahidic text) the Arabic and Ethiopic versions have "at the third hour," a reading which is accepted by Jungklaus, Dix and Botte, whereas Easton follows the Sahidic text and Tateo, impossibly, combines the two readings.<sup>430</sup> Cuming suggests that the translator here was "misled by the context."<sup>431</sup> There is added confusion in that, as Phillips points out, the sacrifice of the lamb in the morning and evening is also known as a "continuous" sacrifice.<sup>432</sup> Our discussion of the meaning of this passage suggests that the Sahidic reading is correct, but independently of those observations we may prefer Cuming's suggestion on the grounds that a translator is more likely to alter "at every hour" to "at the third hour" in order apparently to fit the argument to the context, than to correct the reference to the Old Testament when a statement in context is, superficially at least, correct.

8: This verse is translated from the Sahidic version. The Latin version picks up in the middle of the verse and is as follows: "... the Lord, who does not lie, who was mindful of his saints and sent his Word to illuminate them." For "imitating the manner" the Sahidic has "so that you may know the manner." Botte suggests that *eime* (know) should be emended to *eine* (to imitate), a reading for which there is some support in *Testamentum Domini*.<sup>433</sup>

9: This is rendered from the Latin; the word "type" however is found in the Sahidic version, which, although confused, has at this point retained the Greek word employed. There is also some survival of the Greek of this verse in the Epitome of the *Apostolic Constitutions*.<sup>434</sup>

14: The reading "spittle" is confirmed by the Sahidic version. The Latin version has *spm*, which would usually be the abbreviation for *spiritum* (breath) but could be *sputum* (spittle).<sup>435</sup> It is hard to make sense of the second part of the verse, and the word "prayer" is added to ease translation, although it appears in no version. The interpretation implied draws on the possibility that the prayer of the newly baptized was believed to be especially efficacious. This belief was present in Africa,<sup>436</sup> though not attested to my knowledge in Rome. See further the comment for further justification of this understanding.

15: Botte and Cuming attach the first phrase of this verse to the preceding paragraph. It makes no sense there.<sup>437</sup> A relative pronoun has been supplied after "angels" in accordance with Botte's suggestion,<sup>438</sup> as the Latin version as it stands is difficult.

17: The word "pray" is not found in the Latin version, but may be supplied from the Sahidic. The latter part of the verse is close to meaningless in the Latin version, and the Sahidic version is so greatly expanded as to be unreliable. The words "each day" are therefore supplied in accordance with a suggestion of Dix that this original phrase was present in an unusual form, and so caused confusion to the translators.<sup>439</sup>

#### COMMENT

1: At this point <sup>RCN</sup> is reworking <sup>REL</sup>. Here the direction to wash hands is added to the direction to pray. This direction is also found in the material below, and was presumably added to this in order to bring the directions into line with one another. Cuming comments that washing is "standard rabbinic practice" before prayer.<sup>440</sup> Babylonian Talmud, *Baba Qama*, 82b indicates that it is rabbinic practice before study likewise. The manner in which the custom enters into Christian practice is not clear, though this could be evidence of continuing Christian engagement with Judaism. Tertullian is aware of the custom though he inveighs against it.<sup>441</sup>

2-3: Here <sup>R</sup>CN continues to rework <sup>R</sup>El. Although the same fundamental points are made, the material is expanded. The emphasis on reading is worthy of observation, as it indicates that the place of assembly is, as Brent suggests, also the place at which the community's library is kept. It is also to be noted that the language of prophecy attached to teaching is even more prominent here than in the work of <sup>R</sup>El, as the teacher is said to be functioning through the Holy Spirit. This is an indication that the practice of prophecy in the Roman church is now disappeared altogether, and has been replaced by teaching.<sup>442</sup>

4: As suggested in the discussion of the translation of this verse, it is improbable that individuals would keep books at home. Roughly contemporary book prices are given by Epictetus, who refers to a book by Chrysippus at five denarii (twenty sesterces) and Martial, who likewise gives five denarii as the price of the first book of his *Epigrams*.<sup>443</sup> Whereas these prices would easily be met by those of the senatorial classes who, as suggested in the introduction, might well have been prominent in the Hippolytean community at the time of <sup>R</sup>CN, there were literate persons to whom such prices were not affordable, and so this verse is taken, once again, to refer to the house in which the community met, and in which its library might be found.

5: In the discussion of the text and translation it is suggested that the house is once again that of the church. It may seem strange that there is no corporate prayer "in the house," but private prayer in the context of study in a house of study is known in Judaism.<sup>444</sup>

6: The logic of this verse is hard to follow, as there is a mounting up of metaphors which are hard to disentangle. The fundamental reference is to offerings of the Temple, of the shewbread, which is continually displayed, and of the lamb, which is offered at the third hour; the text appears to be tying the placarding of Jesus and his offering on the cross with the two sacrifices of the Temple. Phillips suggests that the text has confused the two offerings,<sup>445</sup> but the point is that there is a dual reference to two aspects of the crucifixion, namely the display of Jesus (which is compared to the shewbread) and his being offered up (which is compared to the daily sacrifice of the lamb). Thus the timing may be Marcan, but the theology is Johannine, as the lifting up of Jesus on the cross is both an offering and the means by which Jesus may be seen by the world. This illuminates the next pair of



Johannine images; Christ is described as the shepherd because the shepherd offers himself for the sheep, and is described as the bread from Heaven as this bread, unlike that eaten by the ancestors, is bread which does not perish; this is typified by the shewbread which is offered "at every hour." The sacrifice of Christ is thus stated to have taken place at a particular time, but to be of eternal consequence.

8: Botte suggests that the reference is to the prayer of those who pray to the Lord at his descent into Hades. This certainly fits the context.<sup>446</sup>

9: Botte comments that the order of water and blood is found in certain variant readings of Matthew 27:49.<sup>447</sup> It is also to be noted that an active verb "poured out" is used of the water and blood. Connolly points out that this mode of expression, different from that of John, is found twice in *Against Noetus* and in *Benediction of Jacob*.<sup>448</sup> This may be taken as further evidence that the level of redaction to which this chapter is to be assigned is that of <sup>R</sup>CN.

5-9: Bradshaw points out that the justification for prayer at the third, sixth and ninth hours to be found here, all of which are linked to events surrounding the crucifixion and indirectly linked to the sacrifice of the Temple, are not those which are more commonly found explaining the practice of prayer at these hours in this period;<sup>449</sup> the only authors of the period to give justifications however are African. Thus whereas Bradshaw seems to doubt the originality of these verses on that basis, this simply shows that the practice was widespread, and that the explanations given differ because the practice came first. It is also noteworthy that for the African authors, in distinction to *Apostolic Tradition*, these hours are of lesser importance.<sup>450</sup>

10: According to Phillips "The single short sentence concerning prayer at bedtime does not qualify as evening prayer."<sup>451</sup> One may ask why not, though it is to be conceded that this hour of prayer, like that on rising, is of less significance than the prayer at the ninth hour, which is the "other" evening prayer of the text. Phillips thinks it an addition to the text since it does not appear in *Testamentum Domini* or *Canons of Hippolytus*. However evening prayer goes alongside morning prayer, and the prayer on rising is likewise a "minor hour" in comparison to the "true" morning prayer which is offered at the third hour.

11–12: Prayer at midnight is also known in Africa at this time. Tertullian asks whether pagan husbands might think that their Christian wives, who get up in the night to pray, are engaging in magical practices.<sup>452</sup>

13–14: The verses are enclosed in square brackets, for although they are present in all the versions in some way, they may be a gloss, or a series of glosses. They interrupt the flow of the instruction concerning prayer at midnight. The first statement is a straightforward gloss on the possibility that the person who prays is married. What follows may be a negative comment on the washing of hands,<sup>453</sup> though it may also be a gloss on the gloss, suggesting that the prayer of the baptized, if he is faithful, is efficacious whatever his state of life. It is particularly interesting that this passage should directly contradict, whilst illuminating, a comment in 42A and, less certainly, 42B that the Devil is not defeated by spitting but by the sign of the cross. This contradiction is further reason to see this passage as a gloss, though given that the practice recommended is discouraged elsewhere in *Apostolic Tradition* the gloss was perhaps added at a time not long after the original was produced. Spitting on the devil is mentioned by Tertullian at *On idolatry* 11.

15: Chadwick suggests, on the basis of a similar text in the *Testament of Adam*, that this tradition conveyed by the elders is Jewish.<sup>454</sup> However Phillips points out that this text at this point is discussing not prayer at midnight but at noon.<sup>455</sup> The expression indicates those same blessed elders who condemned Noetus,<sup>456</sup> and who are the agents of tradition within the Christian church.

17: Bradshaw, followed by Phillips, suggests that this verse is interpolated, as prayer at cock-crow is not known except in monastic sources from the fourth century, where it appears as a substitute for prayer at midnight, rather than in addition to it.<sup>457</sup> We might add moreover that it is a duplication of the directions found in the first verse that prayer should be offered on awakening, for in a Mediterranean society with limited artificial lighting the cock-crow would in any event be the time at which a person awoke and rose. Although late interpolation is a possible explanation for this, it is simpler to suggest that it results from <sup>R</sup>CN's use of a source, which included prayer at cock-crow at the conclusion of its directions, in accordance with the view that the day ended and began at this point. <sup>R</sup>CN in following the source was nonetheless supplementing the directions of <sup>R</sup>El, which already

included a direction that prayer should be offered upon awakening, with the result that there is a duplication, but no additional hour of prayer. The manner in which this direction follows on from the previous verse, with the word "similarly" is further indication of this, and so this verse may be part of the teaching of the "elders." Phillips however suggests that because no instruction is given to wash hands at this point the text is from a different stratum from that concerning prayer at midnight, which directs that hands be washed. Handwashing is however conceivably included in "likewise."

4-18: *Apostolic Tradition* is perhaps the first appearance of a cycle of daily prayer which is found commonly in later centuries, with prayer in the morning and evening supplemented by prayer three times in the day, and prayer at midnight added. It should be noted that this understanding of the text is in accordance with the recognition that the final appearance of prayer at cock-crow is a duplication of the first appearance of morning prayer, and that the prayer before going to bed is prayer in the evening. This pattern probably derives from the conflation of two ancient but independent patterns of prayer, both rooted in Judaism, one of which consisted of prayer in the morning and the evening, the other of which involved the offering of prayer three times in the day.<sup>458</sup> The prayers at the third and ninth hours were originally morning and evening prayers tied to the offering of sacrifice in the Temple, and are more prominent here than the prayers at rising and retiring.

#### 42B (Dix 37)<sup>459</sup>

*1If you are tempted, reverently sign yourself on the forehead. For this sign of the passion is shown and is proven against the Devil if you make it in faith, and not so that you may show it to people, but present it through knowledge like a shield. 2For when the Adversary sees the power which comes from the heart, and when he sees that the inner man, who is rational, outwardly displays the likeness of the Word which is impressed on him internally, he is put to flight, not by your spitting but by your breathing with your mouth. 3This Moses showed in the paschal sheep which was slaughtered. He sprinkled the blood on the*

threshold and anointed the doorposts, and showed forth that faith in the perfect sheep which is now in us. <sup>4</sup>By signing forehead and eyes with the hand we shall escape the one who is seeking our destruction.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

1-4: This is taken from the Latin text, and is translated independently of 43A. It is however quite possible that the variations between the two in verses 1, 3-4 derive from differences in translation rather than differences in the underlying Greek text.

1: The Latin has "Always imitate (*semper imitare*) reverently to sign yourself . . ." The word "always" has come about through a corruption in the Greek text, where *ei* (if) was misread as *aei* (always) as in chapter 42A. To explain *imitare* Dix suggests further confusion in the Greek text,<sup>460</sup> though Botte more simply suggests a misreading of *temptaris* (if you are tempted).<sup>461</sup>

2: The translation incorporates an extensive conjectural emendation proposed by Botte, who suggests that a line is missing from the Latin text, which is, as it stands, very confused.<sup>462</sup> The line can be filled in from elements in the Sahidic text.

3: Botte suggests that a gloss has found its way into the text here. He suggests that the original read that the Devil is put to flight "by the breath that is in you" (*spm in te*). This was subsequently misread as *sputante* (by spitting) and that a subsequent scribe wrote a note in the margin correcting the error, stating "not by spitting, by breathing" and then giving the correct reading (*non sputante sed flante spiritu in te*), a marginal note which was then taken into the text. There is some support for this in the Sahidic text, which states that the Devil is expelled by the Holy Spirit which is in the person who makes room for it in himself. However, the Latin manuscript is far from clear at this point, and Tidner (by contrast to the previous editor, Hauler, on whose text Dix and Botte equally relied) reads "not spitting but breathing from your mouth" (*non sputante sed flante ore*);<sup>463</sup> if this reading is correct, the Sahidic version could be taken as a rationalization and expansion of a Greek original, which included spitting. Botte believed that 42A, far from being an independent version of this material was simply a corrected version, and therefore did not take the readings in that chapter into account. However, we have seen reason to suspect the appearance of spitting in that chapter, and in 41, found a possible mention of the use of spittle. Thus the Latin version is preferred here, though not with great confidence.

#### COMMENT

See the comment on 42A, and the discussion of the text and translation of 42A and 42B.

## 43B (Dix 38B)

*1And so if these things are received with thankfulness and true faith, they provide upbuilding in the church and eternal life for those who believe. 2I advise that these things should be guarded by all those who are truly wise. For if all of you hear the apostolic tradition and follow it and keep it, no heretic or anyone at all can deceive you. 3For in this way many heresies have grown up, because the pre-eminent ones were unwilling to learn the purpose of the apostles but, following their own desires, did as they wished and not what was fitting.*

*4If we have passed over anything, beloved, God will reveal it to those who are worthy, since he steers the church, which is holy, until it reaches the peaceable haven.*

## TEXT AND TRANSLATION

1: The Latin version misunderstands the Greek term "orthodox," and renders it as "rightly glorious."

2: The Latin text runs out after "Apostolic tradition." The remainder of this chapter is essentially derived from the Sahidic version.

3: Dix prints the following words from the Ethiopic version as verse 3a, suggesting that something had dropped out from the Sahidic version. "These were the perverse who went astray and corrupted the teaching of the apostles, and if men come to them they teach them in this way;"<sup>464</sup> there is however no need to add these words, as the explanation that the pre-eminent (*pro-istamenoï*) did not hearken to the apostolic teaching is sufficient to explain the growth of heresies.

4: The Ethiopic version has: "steers the church into the haven of quietness," a reading followed by Cuming and in part by Dix.<sup>465</sup> For "holy" the Sahidic text has "worthy."<sup>466</sup> Botte believes that the appearance of this term has come about through the influence of the same word in the previous phrase and deletes it altogether;<sup>467</sup> the deletion is unnecessary, as the influence of "worthy" (*axia*) in the previous phrase might explain a corruption of "holy" (*hagia*) to "worthy" in this one. We have followed Botte however in retaining the verb "reaches" since, as he notes, there is no reason to omit it,<sup>468</sup> and rendered "the haven of peacefulness," the reading of the Sahidic text, with "peaceable haven," in accordance with a suggestion of Connolly, made on the basis of several parallels with the *Refutation*.<sup>469</sup>

## COMMENT

In this epilogue the themes set out in the preface are restated. Maintenance of the apostolic tradition, against the whims of the pre-eminent patrons, will preserve the church from error. <sup>R</sup>El uses the image of the ship at sea representing the church beset by heresy, with the peaceable harbor representing true teaching, twice in the *Refutation*;<sup>470</sup> this passage should be read in the light of that thinking.

The Sahidic preserves the Greek word *pro-istanai* which, as was argued in the comment on chapter one above, refers to patrons. The purpose of <sup>R</sup>El's redaction of P, which appears whenever his work is prominent, is to establish episcopal governance within the church over the patrons, and this is given concrete expression in every liturgy and activity of the church. This becomes the apostolic tradition, and the means of maintaining the theological content which is the substantive apostolic tradition in <sup>R</sup>El's understanding, through the bishops who are in a succession of teaching from the apostles<sup>471</sup> and over and against the selfish motivation of those whose sole interest is the maintenance of their own power and privilege. Whether <sup>R</sup>El's redaction of *Apostolic Tradition* was a weapon in the struggle or, as seems more probable, a hymn of victory when the struggle was completed, it represents to us a means of anchoring the rule of faith in the rule of prayer.

## APPENDIX

### “Hippolytus’ ” *Homily on the Psalms*

This homily, probably the work of <sup>R</sup>El, is included as an appendix for three reasons:

a) It was delivered in the context of worship in the Hippolytean community and thus fleshes out the picture given by *Apostolic Tradition*.

b) It informs us further of the Hippolytean view of the episcopate and of the subordinate nature of charismata, the agenda which lie behind <sup>R</sup>El's redaction of *Apostolic Tradition*.

c) It gives some insight into the preoccupations of a scholasticized Christian community.

The Greek text translated is that of Pierre Nautin, whose edition appears (with a French translation) in his *Le dossier d'Hippolyte et de Méliton* (Paris: Cerf, 1953) 161–83. This is the first English translation. A discussion in English, together with references to earlier discussions of the document, may be found in A. Stewart-Sykes “Hermas the Prophet and Hippolytus the Preacher: The Roman Homily and its Social Context” in M.B. Cunningham and P. Allen (eds.), *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 33–63.

#### HIPPOLYTUS, ON THE PSALMS

1) We are obliged, beloved, to demonstrate the true meaning of the psalms. More than one psalm has been weakened so as to lead the soul astray and an error should not be considered a new heresy. For the Devil is always hard at work, carrying forward his original antipathy to humanity, leading us into error and, whilst giving the appearance of pleasure through sophistic artifice, desiring human death.

2) So let us turn now to our subject. David became King of Israel. He was King in Jerusalem and governed the whole multitude of the people which had submitted themselves to him after the death of Saul. He was just in his governance, elected in accordance with the call of God, and wished to bring the ark to Jerusalem. It was in the house of Abinadab, after its return from Ashdod twenty years prior. He came to take the ark and, putting it on a new chariot, he attempted to bring it to Jerusalem. But Uzzah, with a faithless spirit, stretched out his hand towards it and fell dead. So David, who was struck with fear, brought the ark to the house of Obededom of Gittin. During the three months in which it was there he received grace from God, so David, when he learnt that it had blessed Obededom, returned to take the ark from the house of Obededom and bring it to Jerusalem. When it was established there he appointed the tribe of Levi as clergy, and appointed four men from among them as leaders of the singers.

3) The four singers then were Asaph, Heman, Ethan, Jeduthun. The number of those who accompanied them was two hundred and eighty-eight. One might see in this from the beginning the mystery which was prophesied, what the Spirit is showing through the indication of the singers. For to each leader seventy-two singers were assigned. That was the symbol of the plan of God for all humanity from the beginning, since the tower (of Babel) was built by faithless men who were all of one language, and who derived from seventy-two nations. When a righteous wrath was visited upon them, a division of their tongues was brought about and, since they had no understanding of each others' language, they were driven out by the Spirit and formed a dispersion. Thirty-two nations derived from Ham, twenty-five from Shem, fifteen from Japheth, a total of seventy-two. The blessed David, in the Spirit, sought to show their completeness when he assigned seventy-two men to each leader of the singers for the praise of God, prophesying thus that in the last times "every tongue" should glorify God.

4) All of these stood before the sanctuary, praising God, one with



cymbals, one with a psaltery, one with a harp, one with a lute, one with a horn (which he lifted, because the horn of the Savior is lifted up). In the midst of them stood David, himself the leader of the leaders of the singers, holding a psaltery in his hand, and the choir followed their leaders. Each of them, moved by the Spirit, sung hymns to God. As the Spirit skipped onto the blessed Asaph, all kept silence, submitting to a moment of quiet, governed by the Spirit. And they would respond in a manner fitting one who was singing the praises of God by saying "Alleluia," which means, as the Hebrew language is rendered into Greek, "Let us praise the true God."

5) All were then submissive. Just as the Spirit skipped onto the first and seized him, the others ceased. And as it went onto another, again the others were quiet. The apostle Paul, who wished to establish the church with good regulation, employed these words, for this was the manner in which good order was set up in Israel. He taught, saying: "If somebody is given a revelation, the other should be silent, for thus you may all prophesy, one by one. The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets."

6) The psalms number altogether one hundred and fifty. Some think, because they have not studied with sufficient care, that all are of the blessed David, but this is not what is signified. All are attributed to David, but the titles indicate which psalm is assigned to whom. I have said that four leaders of the singers were elected, and that there were two hundred and eighty-eight accompanists. The psalms are assigned to the four leaders, as indeed the titles indicate. For when it says "A psalm of the sons of Korah," Asaph and Heman uttered it. When it says "A psalm of Asaph," Asaph himself uttered it. When it says, "A psalm of Jeduthun," Jeduthun himself chants. When it says "A psalm of David," David himself was the speaker. But when it says "A psalm to David" it was addressed to David by another.

7) There are, in all, one hundred and fifty psalms, of which seventy-two are to David, nine of David, twelve of Asaph, twelve of the sons of Korah, one of Jeduthun, one to Ethan, one to Solomon, two to Haggai and Zachariah, thirty-nine are without title and one to

Moses, a total of one hundred and fifty. We must now consider the mystery of by what rationale the psalter is attributed to David when there are different singers and when not all of the psalms are by David. We shall miss nothing out. The rationale of the attribution is this; he was himself the cause of all that came about. He chose the singers himself, and since he was himself the cause he should be considered worthy of the honor that all that the singers uttered should be reckoned to David. We shall adduce some further reasons. A book is assigned to Esther; although Esther did one thing only, whereas Mordecai did many, but the book is not entitled "Of Mordecai" but "Of Esther." The reason is that Esther, as queen, offered her life for the protection of the children of Israel who then were persecuted, and on account of her good deed and the faith which she had in God she was held worthy to be honored as the principal accomplisher of the deed. Thus the book is entitled "Esther." In the same sense that the book is assigned to Esther, as she was the cause of rescue, in the same manner, since David was the cause of this glorification given to God, the book is assigned to him.

8) All of this is in accordance with the narrative which we have developed. Let those who think themselves learned attend and, although they dare not give praise, still let them be forced to say: "You have been studying since your youth!" And why did you not do the same?! You should not speak of what you know nothing and of which you have not learnt. The difficulties brought about through ignorance, and through attempting to instruct others in those things one has not learnt, causes the construction of error, to confound the hearers and give rise to empty praise. You should first have applied yourself to learning, in order then to be equipped to instruct well.

9) Let us now turn to our subject. Different titles are applied to the psalms, and we should not simply note them in passing but apply ourselves to them with all enthusiasm, for this is required of those who listen to them. For when it states "Psalm of the inheritance" the title is not present regardless, no indeed; these matters are so arranged that they should be believed in the same way as what it says

concerning the Son. It says "Psalm of the inheritance" and goes on to say: "Listen, Lord, to my words, understand my cry and give ear to the sound of my prayer, my King and my God." Now what inheritance can it mean, apart from the church, which acknowledges Christ as Lord and King? Upon whom it calls as it says: "For this reason the young women have loved you, have pulled you out." She is herself the inheritance, and thus the scribe, moved by the Spirit, did right in supplying such a title. Through this title what follows is indicated in a fitting manner by the Spirit. She it is who is the inheritance, she it is who acknowledges her Lord and King, as it states in another psalm: "Listen, daughter, and be sure to incline your ear, and take leave of your people and your father's house, and the King shall desire your beauty, wherefore he is your Lord and you shall bow down to him." She it is who is the inheritance, and who bows down to Christ.

10) Another title: "Psalm on the Octave." In what way? It does not say "ogdoad," as Valentinus rather forcibly would have it, but "On the Octave." The octave indicates the day of judgment. The psalm instructs us that judgment is the meaning of the text: "Lord, do not punish me in your wrath, nor discipline me in your anger."

11) Yet another title: "Psalm of the hidden things of the Son." It is necessary for us to acknowledge that this concerns the Son in the same manner that the previous material concerned him. For it says: "A psalm concerning the hidden things of the Son. I shall confess to you, Lord, with all my heart, I shall proclaim your marvels." Who was it who confessed the father, yet cried out and spoke with clarity of speech? "I confess to you Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because you have hidden these things from the wise and understanding and have revealed them to the simple. Yes, Father, because that it was your good pleasure in your sight." Let us see, then, beloved, the Son of God proclaimed here.

12) Another title is "Psalm of the wine-vat." What are these vats, except the blessed prophets? For just as the vat receives the sweet wine from the crushed grape, and just as therein it is boiled and fer-

mented, likewise the Holy Spirit flows into the prophets, as Christ was crushed like a grape, and "delights the heart" just as does sweet wine. This is easy to see because the title shows the meaning of the psalm and the psalm shows the meaning of the words which are to be interpreted. For it is added "from the mouth of babies and infants you have found praise." Christ says: "You have revealed these things to suckling infants." He is speaking to the prophets, because they are sharers in the Holy Spirit living far from evil like children, and so they build the glorious school of grace. Rightly did David sing about them.

13) Another has the title: "Song of understanding." What does "understanding" denote but this: beloved, to understand is to avoid sin, to confess to God, to begin by speaking of sin and so to be justified. That the title intends the forgiveness of sin is proved when it goes on to say "Blessed are those whose iniquities are forgiven and whose sins are wiped out. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputes no guilt."

14) Again, another title is "Psalm of Ascents." What does this mean? Which "ascents"? Are they the stairs to the sanctuary built of stone? No indeed! By "ascents" he means the clergy, the living successors of the fathers of old, who praise God and manifest the mystery of the doxology. That this is the case is shown by the verse: "Unless the Lord build the house, in vain do the builders labour." The apostle clearly shows that it is right to call the clergy "ascents" when he says: "Those who minister well gain for themselves good standing."

15) In another he gives the title: "Inscription on a monument." This means whatever is indicated through the Holy Scriptures. A "monument" is universally taken to mean a memorial for the dead. "Inscription on a monument" therefore is for the commemoration of the one who was buried, that again mystically shows us concerning the death and the resurrection of Christ. Scripture tells me that it is so, for the psalm itself contains the following: "I beheld the Lord before me, he stood at my right hand at all times that I should not

come to harm. That is why my heart has rejoiced and my tongue is exultant. Even my flesh shall dwell in hope. For you have not abandoned my life in hell, nor shall you permit your holy one to see corruption. You have guided me in paths of righteousness, you have filled me with rejoicing in the sight of your countenance." Thus "inscription on a monument" is as a commemoration of him who would be raised, so that he might receive the entirety of his inheritance from the father and might justly be Lord of "things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth."

16) And again, in another, "A psalm to the beloved." Who could the beloved be other than the Child of God, the Word which was "begotten before the dawn," through whom the Father made all things? He is the beloved concerning whom he spoke, crying out from heaven: "This is my Son, the well beloved, in whom I am well pleased. Listen to him." That this is the significance of Scripture, and that it is concerning him that the Scripture says: "This is my beloved," the psalm shouts out as it says: "My heart has put forth a good Word."

17) Since these canons of interpretation are rightly to be proclaimed and the doctrine of this nature is to be heard with faith, we, the hearers, are obliged, should we have the fear of God, to accept them in faith, and not to listen to misleading words but to follow the Scriptures according to their true meaning. For each disciple of Christ full of faith and love stands trembling before the mysteries of God which are gloriously expressed. And we are already oriented towards the heavens, there hidden, not turning ourselves, on account of pleasure, to earth but exalted, on account of love, to heaven. For it is required that our soul take wings in the Spirit, that it should fly upward together with its body. Whoever is concerned entirely with things below is readily destroyed, for on earth lurks hidden the one who can bite the heel, whereas the Word, who seeks to raise humanity from the things below, appears from heaven. Concerning this he shouts out and says: "A man whose name is 'east,' he shall raise himself from below." He has raised himself from the lower

regions to those above in order that all might who seek them might there be raised, following the word of truth, and so go on high where Christ is at the right hand of the Father. Therefore let us be followers of the truth, let us rebuff human persuasion, let us receive the true meaning of the word.

18) After this proof which concerns all the psalms, in which we have recognized that even the titles are necessary and were composed with the Holy Spirit, for they likewise may be recognized as mysteries, let us turn to the reading which took place. Two psalms were read to us and it is necessary to state why they are the first.

19) These opening psalms are without title, for the first displays the birth of Christ, the second his passion. It was not necessary to give them titles since whenever the Word is proclaimed, by all the prophets, the Word is its own beginning. He cries out thus and says: "I am the beginning and the end, the alpha and the omega." So when blessed David spoke in the Spirit there was no need of a title.

20) Thus after this proof it is clear that the Son of God is proclaimed at the beginning; through these psalms is betokened the Word, the Wisdom, the only-begotten Son of the Father. Thus it says: "Blessed is the man who has not walked in the counsel of the impious ..." and the rest, and: "Why do the nations conspire ..." and the rest.

## Notes

### INTRODUCTION

<sup>1</sup>So, most recently C. Marksches, "Wer schrieb die sogenannte *Traditio Apostolica*? Neue Beobachtungen und Hypothesen zu einer kaum lösbaren Frage aus der altkirchlichen Literaturgeschichte," in W. Kinzig, C. Marksches, M. Vinzent, *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 1–74; P.F. Bradshaw, "Redating the Apostolic Tradition: Some Preliminary Steps," in J. Baldovin and N. Mitchell (eds.), *Rule of Prayer, Rule of Faith* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1996), 3–17. Note also Marcel Metzger, "Nouvelles Perspectives pour la prétendue Tradition apostolique," *Ecclesia Orans*, 5 (1988), 241–59; idem, "A propos des règlements ecclésiastiques et de la prétendue Tradition Apostolique," *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, 66 (1992), 249–61; idem, "Enquêtes autour de la prétendue Tradition apostolique," *Ecclesia Orans*, 9 (1992), 7–36.

<sup>2</sup>This is the date of Hippolytus' death, by which time his community was reconciled with the wider Roman church. As will be shown further below in the introduction and in the commentary, *Apostolic Tradition* is marked by the effect of this reconciliation. Earlier studies of *Apostolic Tradition* have tended to date the work earlier in the third century, or even to the latter part of the second century. See in particular C.C. Richardson, "The Date and Setting of the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus," *AngThR* 30 (1948), 38–44. These datings however all took off from erroneous assumptions about a schism which never took place, and about the unity of the corpus of writings attributed to Hippolytus, both of which issues will be addressed further below.

<sup>3</sup>Allen Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tension before the Emergence of a Monarch-Bishop* (VigChr Supp 31; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 409–12 in summary; Peter Lampe, *Die Stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten* (WUNT 2.18; Tübingen: Mohr, 1987), 334–45.

<sup>4</sup>Brent, *Hippolytus*, 368.

<sup>5</sup>So note in particular the discussion of James S. Jeffers, *Conflict at Rome: Social Order and Hierarchy in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 40–2.

<sup>6</sup>Clement, 1.3; 21.6; 44.5, 47.6; Hermas, *Vision*, 2.2.6; 2.4.2; 2.4.3.

<sup>7</sup>Lampe, *Stadtrömischen Christen*, 331, 337.

<sup>8</sup>Eric G. Jay, "From Presbyter-Bishops to Bishops and Presbyters," *SCent* 1 (1981), 125–62 is a readable summary and review of this generally agreed position.

<sup>9</sup>Hermas, *Vision*, 2.4.3.

<sup>10</sup>Lampe, *Stadtrömischen Christen*, 337–9 argues that the main impetus was economic, cf. Brent, *Hippolytus*, 411–12.

<sup>11</sup>Lampe, *Stadtromischen Christen*, 334.

<sup>12</sup>See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 5.23–24. This passage may be found with some discussion and clarification at A. Stewart-Sykes, *Melito of Sardis: On Pascha* (Crestwood NY: SVS Press, 2001), 84–91.

<sup>13</sup>Brent, *Hippolytus*, 412; Manlio Simonetti, "Una nuova proposta su Ippolito," *Augustinianum* 36 (1996), 13–46, at 42 is correct however in taking Brent to task for implying that Eusebius had corrupted the text of Polycrates' letter at *Ecclesiastical History*, 5.23. However, the fact that Polycrates had convened a council of bishops in Asia does not mean that he did so at the behest of Victor, as Simonetti implies, but more probably that he did so in order to rally support for Asian congregations at Rome in opposition to Victor's attempt to regulate Quartodeciman congregations.

<sup>14</sup>Brent, *Hippolytus*, 452.

<sup>15</sup>Simonetti, "Nuova proposta," 34–5 with reference to *Ecclesiastical History*, 4.23.11.

<sup>16</sup>Gregory Dix, rev. by H. Chadwick, *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of Saint Hippolytus of Rome* (Ridgefield CT: Morehouse, 1968), xxxv–xxxvii.

<sup>17</sup>D. L. Powell, "The schism of Hippolytus" in E. A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, 12 (TU 115; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975), 449–56, with reference to the preface to the *Refutation*; Powell's argument is confused by his attempt to see the two ordination prayers to be found in *Apostolic Tradition* as works of the same hand, but his fundamental argument nonetheless holds good: the claim in the preface of the *Refutation* to participate in the high-priesthood does not entail a claim to monepiscopacy, and there is no contemporary evidence of a schism other than this.

<sup>18</sup>E. von Goltz, "Die Taufgebete Hippolyts und andere Taufgebete der alten Kirche," *ZKG* 1 (1906), 1–27.

<sup>19</sup>E. Schwartz, "Über die pseudapostolischen Kirchenordnungen," *Schriften der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft im Strassburg* 6 (1910); R. H. Connolly, *The So-called Egyptian Church Order and Derived Documents* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916).

<sup>20</sup>The reasoning is laid out slightly more extensively than it is here by Chadwick in Dix, *Treatise*, d–e. We return to the discussion of the statue in more detail below.

<sup>21</sup>J. M. Hanssens, *La liturgie d'Hippolyte: ses documents, son titulaire, ses origines et son caractère* (Rome: Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies, 1959).

<sup>22</sup>A. Salles, "La Tradition apostolique: est-elle un témoin de la liturgie romaine?," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 148 (1956), 181–213.

<sup>23</sup>Here too there is a significant social difference between the period of *Apostolic Tradition* and the classical Roman sacramentaries that describe the later rites, which impacts upon the liturgies themselves, for by the time of the sacramentaries, rites had developed to meet the needs of adults who sought baptism having been nominal catechumens since their birth, whereas Hippolytus would know nothing of the nominal catechumen. By the time of the sacramentaries, the rites were actually being practised on infants, though this has limited effect on the ritual at first.

<sup>24</sup>Bernard Botte, "A propos de la 'Tradition apostolique,'" *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, 33 (1966), 177–86, at 180–1.

<sup>25</sup>Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, 1.14 states that Marcionites gave milk and honey at



the baptismal eucharist. This custom must therefore have been known to Marcionites in Rome.

<sup>26</sup>See R.H. Connolly, "An Ancient Prayer in the Mediaeval Euchologia," *JTS* 19 (1918), 132-44, at 142-3.

<sup>27</sup>So E.C. Whitaker, "Baptism" in G.J. Cuming (ed.), *Essays on Hippolytus* (Bramcote: Grove, 1978), 52-60, at 60.

<sup>28</sup>On both burial methods and the liturgy presupposed by chapter 22, see the commentary ad loc.

<sup>29</sup>Brent, *Hippolytus*, 192-5.

<sup>30</sup>For a balanced discussion, see Brent, *Hippolytus*, 184-97. Significant contributions to the debate of which notice will not otherwise be given here include Jean Magne, *Tradition Apostolique sur les charismes et diataxeis des saints apôtres* (Paris: Private publication, 1975); B. Botte, "L'authenticité de la Tradition apostolique de saint Hippolyte," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, 16 (1949), 177-85.

<sup>31</sup>So Nils Hyldahl, "Zum Titel Peri Pascha bei Meliton," *Studia Theologica*, 19 (1965), 55-67.

<sup>32</sup>A Greek fragment of chapter 36, published by Marcel Richard, "Quelques fragments des pères anténicéens et nicéens," *Symbolae Osloenses*, 38 (1963), 76-83. A similar title, "Regulations of the holy apostles concerning ordinations through Hippolytus" is found in the epitome of the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

<sup>33</sup>So Brent, *Hippolytus*, 188.

<sup>34</sup>So E. Hennecke, "Hippolyts Schrift 'apostolischen Überlieferung über Gnaden-gaben,'" *Harnack-Ehrung* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1921), 159-82, at 171-4. J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, I.2 (London: Macmillan, 1890), 400 made the same suggestion even before the identification of the Egyptian Church Order with the work of Hippolytus, but there is no reason to deny, as Lightfoot does, that a discussion of charismata might not lead to the discussion of church order.

<sup>35</sup>So Hanssens, *Liturgie*, 109-110, 250-1.

<sup>36</sup>Brent, *Hippolytus*, 195-6.

<sup>37</sup>Thus in response to Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, I.2, 400, followed by J.V. Bartlet, *Church Life and Church Order* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1943), 105-19 who, accepting that the extant first chapter of *Apostolic Tradition* is Hippolytean, deny that the rest is to be attributed thus on the grounds that there is no connection between church order and the theological discussion which the mention of the tradition might conjure up.

<sup>38</sup>Brent, *Hippolytus*, 206-58.

<sup>39</sup>E.g. by E.C. Ratcliff, "Apostolic Tradition: Questions Concerning the Appointment of the Bishop," in F.L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, 8 (TU 93; Berlin: Akademie, 1966), 266-70; E. Segelberg, "The Ordination Prayers in Hippolytus" in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, 13 (TU 116; Berlin: Akademie, 1975), 397-408; P.F. Bradshaw, "The Participation of Other Bishops in the Ordination of a Bishop in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus" in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, 18 (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1989), 335-7; Marksches, "Wer schrieb?," 44-53.

<sup>40</sup>It is indeed possible that the first was also called Hippolytus, though this can-

not be known. The name, to avoid confusion, is studiously avoided throughout the commentary in any case.

<sup>41</sup>Pierre Nautin, *Hippolyte et Josipe* (Paris: Cerf, 1947).

<sup>42</sup>Nautin, *Hippolyte et Josipe*, 80–82.

<sup>43</sup>Vincenzo Loi, "L'Identità letteraria di Ippolyto di Roma"; M. Simonetti, "A modo di conclusione: una ipotesi di lavoro," both in *Ricerche su Ippolyto* (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum, 13; Rome: Institutum Augustinianum, 1977), 67–88 and 151–6 respectively.

<sup>44</sup>Loi, "Identità letteraria," 78–81.

<sup>45</sup>Brent, *Hippolytus*, 109–14 in conclusion.

<sup>46</sup>Brent, *Hippolytus*, 365–7 in summary conclusion of extensive argument. Although Simonetti, "Nuova proposta" finds no reason to abandon his idea of two Hippolyti, one of whom is eastern the other Roman, he cannot explain the confusion. His suggestion of some interchange between the two finds no support in the texts, whereas Brent's at least may be grounded in his vision of the statue as the artefact of a school.

<sup>47</sup>Brent, *Hippolytus*, 112.

<sup>48</sup>Brent, *Hippolytus*, 305–6.

<sup>49</sup>Brent, *Hippolytus*, 302–6.

<sup>50</sup>Thus the succession of teaching and tradition is handed down by "presbyters of blessed memory" (*Against Noetus*, 1).

<sup>51</sup>Paul Bradshaw *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* (London: SPCK, 1992), 101–2; "Redating," 4.

<sup>52</sup>Metzger, "Règlements ecclésiastiques," notes the parallel situation with biblical literature with regard to attribution, and argues that the product is redactional. However, there is no reason why Hippolytus should not be the final redactor at this level of *Apostolic Tradition*.

<sup>53</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, XXXII.

<sup>54</sup>Hennecke, "Hippolyts Schrift," 160; this is, however, a suggestion only, which is not pursued.

<sup>55</sup>Ernst Jungklaus, *Die Gemeinde Hippolyts* (TU 46.2; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1928), 46.

<sup>56</sup>Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London: Dacre, 1945), 82–5.

<sup>57</sup>Fundamental is the study of A. Wilmart, "Le texte Latin de la paradosis de S Hippolyte," *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, 9 (1919), 62–78. Wilmart suggests that the second conclusion is a revision of the first, which is precisely the solution we propose here. Beyond this we are in a position to explain why the first edition was revised.

<sup>58</sup>L.E. Phillips, "Daily Prayer in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus," *JTS* ns 40 (1989), 389–400, at 391.

<sup>59</sup>B.S. Easton, *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934), 61.

<sup>60</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 21.

<sup>61</sup>Botte, "Passage difficile."

<sup>62</sup>Phillips, "Daily prayer," 391.

<sup>63</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, XXXII–XXXIII.

<sup>64</sup>Hermas, *Vision*, 3.5.1.

<sup>65</sup>Hermas, *Vision*, 2.4.3.

<sup>66</sup>Hermas, *Similitude*, 9.15.4; 9.16.5.

<sup>67</sup>Hermas, *Similitude*, 9.19.2–3.

<sup>68</sup>Hermas, *Mandate*, 11.

<sup>69</sup>Irenaeus, *Against the Heresies*, 1.27.2; also <sup>8</sup>El., *Refutation*, 10.19.

<sup>70</sup>Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 42.2.1–5.

<sup>71</sup>Gustav Bardy, "Les Écoles Romaines au second siècle," *RHE* 28 (1932), 501–32 at 511–12.

<sup>72</sup>Bardy, "Écoles Romaines," 521–30.

<sup>73</sup>R. Alan Culpepper, *The Johannine School: An Evaluation of the Johannine-School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of the Nature of Ancient Schools* (SBLDS 26; Missoula Mont: Scholars, 1975), 259.

<sup>74</sup>Thus the Pythagoreans had three years of instruction, followed by five years of silence! (Iamblichus, *On the Pythagorean Way of Life*, 17). An initial enquiry, like that described at chapter 15 of *Apostolic Tradition*, was also known.

<sup>75</sup>*Refutation*, 9.7, 9.12.

<sup>76</sup>*On the Psalms*, 17, 12.

<sup>77</sup>Such is Hermas; see A. Stewart-Sykes, "Hermas the Prophet and Hippolytus the Preacher: the Roman Homily and Its Social Context," in M.B. Cunningham, P. Allen (eds.), *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 34–63, at 36–7.

<sup>78</sup>E.g. at *Similitude*, 9.27.2.

<sup>79</sup>Harry O. Maier, *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of Hermas, Clement and Ignatius* (Dissertations SR 1; Waterloo ON: Wilfred Laurier, 1991), 63; see also R.A. Campbell, *The Elders* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1994) 224.

<sup>80</sup>"Those who stand at the head of the churches" (*Apostolic Tradition* 1.5).

<sup>81</sup>See the commentary on chapter 1, and observe the use of the term in chapter 43B. It is a term generally employed to refer to leaders by both Hippolytean redactors, as is shown by Connolly, *So-called Egyptian Church Order*, 164.

<sup>82</sup>Hermas, *Vision*, 2.4.3.

<sup>83</sup>J.E. Stam, "Charismatic Theology in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus" in G.F. Hawthorne (ed.), *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 267–76, at 269, following and expanding Hennecke, "Hippolytus Schrift," 174–7.

<sup>84</sup>Magne, *Tradition Apostolique*, 53–5, gives us a reconstruction, based on the exclusion of apparent glosses from the text of *Apostolic Constitutions*. See also the discussion of Hennecke, "Hippolytus Schrift."

<sup>85</sup>For more extensive discussion of this series of conflicts and their inter-relationship, see my *From Prophecy to Preaching* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), chapter 3, and "Hermas and Hippolytus."

<sup>86</sup>Lampe, *Stadtrömischen Christen*, 96.

<sup>87</sup>Information on the prices of statues in the period, with full citation of the relevant inscriptional evidence, is found at L. Friedlaender, *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*, IV (Etr) (New York: Dutton, 1913), 287–296.

<sup>88</sup>Beyond this briefest of notices, see the introduction to Botte's edition, and B.

Botte, "La texte de la Tradition apostolique," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, 22 (1955), 161-72. Hanssens, *Liturgie*, is comprised largely of a minute comparison of the various versions.

<sup>89</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, liv.

<sup>90</sup>G. Cuming, *Hippolytus: A Text for Students* (Bramcote: Grove, 1976).

<sup>91</sup>Dix, *Treatise*.

<sup>92</sup>Botte manages to have his cake and eat it, by presenting on facing pages Latin versions of the original texts and a French version of what he believes the correct version to be!

<sup>93</sup>Brent, *Hippolytus*, 458.

<sup>94</sup>A question raised by Bradshaw, *Search*, 104-9.

## TEXT AND COMMENTARY

<sup>1</sup>So Dix, *Treatise*, 1.

<sup>2</sup>Published by R.H. Connolly, "The Prologue to the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus," *JTS* 22 (1921), 356-61, and independently by E. Hennecke, "Der Prolog zur 'apostolischen Überlieferung,'" *ZNW* 22 (1923), 144-6.

<sup>3</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 1.

<sup>4</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 3 n.2. Whereas the results are much the same, Botte manages to explain the logic behind the Latin translator's method.

<sup>5</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 3 n.4.

<sup>6</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 1.

<sup>7</sup>Also that of Dix, *Treatise*, 2, Tateo, *Ippolito*, 80.

<sup>8</sup>So Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 5, Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 8. Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 122, thinks the ignorant are intended, on the apparent assumption that the leaders are already doing everything right, which hardly explains <sup>8</sup>El's need to write.

<sup>9</sup>So L. Bouyer, *Eucharist* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1968), 166; J.E. Stam, "Charismatic Theology in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus" in G.F. Hawthorne (ed.), *Current issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 267-76, at 267.

<sup>10</sup>Hermas, *Vision*, 2.4.3.

<sup>11</sup>Harry O. Maier, *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of Hermas, Clement and Ignatius* (Dissertations SR 1; Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred Laurier, University Press, 1991), 63. See also R.A. Campbell, *The Elders* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1994), 224.

<sup>12</sup>So A. Stewart-Sykes, "Hermas the Prophet and Hippolytus the Preacher: The Roman Homily and its Social Context" in M.B. Cunningham and P. Allen (eds.) *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 33-63, at 36-7.

<sup>13</sup>On the ambiguity inherent in the term see the brief discussion at Wayne E. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 134 and 234 at n.75, with reference to Romans 12:8 where the *pro-istamēnos* is clearly a patron,

and I Thessalonians 5:12 where either, or both, senses of the word may be intended.

<sup>14</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 5 n.8.

<sup>15</sup>E.C. Ratcliff, "Apostolic Tradition: Questions concerning the Appointment of the Bishop" in E.L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, 8 (TU 93; Berlin: Akademie, 1966), 266-70, at 266-7.

<sup>16</sup>P.F. Bradshaw, "Ordination" in G.J. Cuming (ed.), *Essays on Hippolytus* (Bramcote: Grove, 1978), 33-8 at 33.

<sup>17</sup>So Cyprian, *Letter* 55.8.2.

<sup>18</sup>Here he is followed by Bradshaw, "Ordination," 33.

<sup>19</sup>P.F. Bradshaw, "The Participation of Other Bishops in the Ordination of a Bishop in the *Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*" in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, 18 (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1989), 335-7, at 336.

<sup>20</sup>So Alistair Stewart-Sykes, "Vita Polycarpi: An ante-Nicene Vita," *Augustinianum*, 40 (2000), 21-33.

<sup>21</sup>*Life of Polycarp*, 22; text in J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, II 3 (London: Macmillan, 1889), 433-65.

<sup>22</sup>Allen Brent, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century* (VigChr Supp 31; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 305.

<sup>23</sup>So Dix, *Treatise*, 3; Dix is followed by, among others, K. Richter, "Zum Ritus der Bischofsordination in der 'Apostolischen Überlieferung' Hippolyts von Rom und der davon abhängigen Schriften," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 17 (1975), 7-51, at 16, and W. Rordorf, "L'Ordination de l'évêque selon la tradition apostolique d'Hippolyte de Rome," *Questions Liturgiques*, 55 (1974), 137-51, at 143.

<sup>24</sup>Which Richter, "Bischofsordination," 16, thinks absurd; Brent, *Hippolytus*, 467-8, however, reckons this the original pattern.

<sup>25</sup>Bradshaw, "Participation," 336. For other, earlier, suggestions that this should be the case, see Richter, "Bischofsordination," 16 at n.55. Ratcliff, "Apostolic Tradition," 269, believes that an ordination by presbyters was originally intended at this point but that the text is interpolated. The first belief does not entail the second.

<sup>26</sup>A. F. Walls, "The Latin Version of Hippolytus' Apostolic Tradition" in E.L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, 3 (TU 78; Berlin: Akademie, 1961), 155-62, at 159.

<sup>27</sup>Cf. J.E. Stam, *Episcopacy in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus* (Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Kommission, 1969), 20-1, who likewise notes the awkwardness of two layings on of hands, and suggests that the account is a harmonization of two traditions. However, Stam suggests that the presbyteral ordination is of Jewish origin which has been overlaid with Christian episcopacy.

<sup>28</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 3 n.4.

<sup>29</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 9 n.6.

<sup>30</sup>Walls, "Latin version," 161-2, n.4.

<sup>31</sup>Stam, *Episcopacy*, 102-3, with reference to *Refutation*, Proem. 6.

<sup>32</sup>On one of which of particular interest, the addition of "working with the plough of your cross" after mention of the apostles, see Dix, *Treatise*, 86.

<sup>33</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 5.

<sup>34</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 11.

<sup>35</sup>J.A. Jungmann, "Die Doxologien in der Kirchenordnung Hippolyts," *Zeitschrift*

für katholische Theologie, 86 (1964), 321–6, at 323–4.

<sup>36</sup>See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 403.

<sup>37</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 4.

<sup>38</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 7.

<sup>39</sup>Brent, *Hippolytus*, 303–4. See also *Refutation* 9.12 and 10.5; the same similarity between *Refutation* and the prayer at *Apostolic Tradition* 3 is noted by J. Lécuyer, "Épiscopat et Presbytérat dans les écrits d'Hippolyte de Rome," *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, 41 (1953) 30–50, at 32.

<sup>40</sup>Ulrich Neymeyr, *Die christlichen Lehrer im zweiten Jahrhundert* (VigChr Supp 4; Leiden: Brill, 1989), 218–20, notes the various ways in which teachers in the ancient world might support themselves. The other option apart from the charging of fees or dependence upon patronage would be an officially endowed chair, which is clearly out of the question here.

<sup>41</sup>Lucian, *On Salaried Posts in Great Houses*, especially 14–18, 26.

<sup>42</sup>For a theological commentary on this part of the prayer from a Roman catholic perspective see J. Lécuyer, "La prière d'ordination de l'évêque: le pontifical Romain et la 'Tradition apostolique' d'Hippolyte," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 89 (1967), 601–6.

<sup>43</sup>Bradshaw, "Redating," 7–8.

<sup>44</sup>Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 9.

<sup>45</sup>Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 1.27.1; 3.3.2–3.

<sup>46</sup>There is no new heading in any of the versions; the chapter division is that of Dix, retained by Botte, and is employed for ease of comparison with other editions only. The rite that follows is closely tied to the ordination of a bishop, and rather than representing, or intending to represent, the usual eucharist of this community, it is specifically the eucharist offered by the newly ordained bishop. That is the reason why there is no heading, and is the context in which interpretation will be offered.

<sup>47</sup>This translation incorporates a significant emendation of the text, discussed in the comment below. Without the emendation the text would read: And we ask that you should send your Holy Spirit on the offering of the holy church: gathering it into one, may you grant to all the saints who receive for the fullness of the Holy Spirit, for the confirmation of their faith in truth, that we may praise and glorify you through your child Jesus Christ . . .

<sup>48</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 6.

<sup>49</sup>Ephrem Lash, "Sursum Corda: The Meaning of a Dialogue" *Sobornost*, 18 (1996), 19–29, at 19–20 and 27 n.4.

<sup>50</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 8.

<sup>51</sup>Botte, *Tradition apostolique*, 16 n.1.

<sup>52</sup>Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 11.

<sup>53</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 17 n.3.

<sup>54</sup>See above 3.4 and 3.5.

<sup>55</sup>E.C. Ratcliff, "The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora," *JEH* 1 (1950), 29–36, 125–34, at 126–8.

<sup>56</sup>This is the implicit understanding of the Ethiopic translator.

<sup>57</sup>So Cuming, "Eucharist," 48, though it is to be noted that he disregards his own suggestion in his translation.

<sup>58</sup>G. Cuming, "The Eucharist" in G.J. Cuming (ed.), *Essays on Hippolytus* (Bramcote: Grove, 1978), 39–51, at 48.

<sup>59</sup>Bernard Botte, "L'epiclèse de l'anaphore d'Hippolyte," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, 14 (1947), 241–51, at 250.

<sup>60</sup>C.C. Richardson, "A Note on the Epicleses in Hippolytus and the *Testamentum Domini*," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, 15 (1948), 357–9, at 359; note also idem, "The So-called Epiclesis in Hippolytus," *Harvard Theological Review*, 40 (1947), 101–8.

<sup>61</sup>Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 11.

<sup>62</sup>Richardson, "Note," 358.

<sup>63</sup>R.H. Connolly, "The Eucharistic Prayer of Hippolytus," *JTS* 39 (1938), 350–69, at 355.

<sup>64</sup>C.A. Bouman, "Variants in the Introduction to the Eucharistic Prayer," *VigChr* 4 (1950), 94–115, at 109 n.38.

<sup>65</sup>Connolly, "Eucharistic Prayer," 355.

<sup>66</sup>On the relationship between this dialogue and that known in the classical eastern liturgies see Bouman, "Variants," *passim*.

<sup>67</sup>Connolly, "Eucharistic Prayer," 356.

<sup>68</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 32.

<sup>69</sup>Connolly, "Eucharistic Prayer," 357.

<sup>70</sup>Bernard Botte, "Extendit manus suas cum pateretur," *Questions Liturgiques*, 49 (1968), 307–8.

<sup>71</sup>Botte, "Extendit manus," 307, with reference to Epictetus, *Discourses*, 3.26.22, and Artemidorus, *On the Interpretation of Dreams*, 1.76.

<sup>72</sup>Connolly "Eucharistic prayer," 360; E.J. Lengeling, "Hippolyt von Rom und die Wendung 'extendit manus suas cum pateretur,'" *Questions Liturgiques*, 50 (1969), 141–4.

<sup>73</sup>Lengeling, "Hippolyt," 144.

<sup>74</sup>Victor Saxer, "Il étendit les mains à l'heure de sa Passion: Le thème de l'orante dans la littérature chrétienne des II<sup>e</sup> et III<sup>e</sup> siècles," *Augustinianum*, 20 (1980), 335–65, at 350, with particular reference to *Commentary on Daniel*, 3.24.

<sup>75</sup>Connolly, "Eucharistic Prayer," 362.

<sup>76</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 8 n.8 simply states "limit: probably of hell."

<sup>77</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 15 and 15 n.4.

<sup>78</sup>Ron Grove, "'Terminum figat': Clarifying the Meaning of a Phrase in the 'Apostolic Tradition,'" *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 48 (1982), 431–4.

<sup>79</sup>Brent, *Hippolytus*, 303–4.

<sup>80</sup>Connolly, "Eucharistic Prayer," 362.

<sup>81</sup>Connolly, "Eucharistic Prayer," 363.

<sup>82</sup>*Testamentum Domini* actually has "you make my resurrection" here, but W.E. Pitt, "Anamnesis and Institution Narrative in the Liturgy of *Apostolic Constitutions* 8," *JEH* 9 (1958), 1–7, at 5, reasonably suggests that this came about through a misreading of *anamnēsis* (memorial) as *anastasis* (resurrection).

<sup>83</sup>Pitt, "Anamnesis and Institution Narrative," 1–7.

<sup>84</sup>Justin, *First Apology*, 64.

<sup>85</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 73.

<sup>86</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 73.

<sup>87</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 75–9.

<sup>88</sup>So Botte, "Epiclèse," 245–7.

<sup>89</sup>The classic statement on the authorship and date of this homily is that of R. Cantalamessa, *L'Omelia 'In S. Pascha' dello ps-Ippolyto di Roma* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1967).

<sup>90</sup>Richardson, "So-called Epiclesis," 102.

<sup>91</sup>Ratcliff, "Sanctus."

<sup>92</sup>K. Küppers, "Die literarisch theologische Einheit von Eucharistiegebet und Bischofsweihegebet bei Hippolyt," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 29 (1987), 19–30, at 23. The absence is also noted by Ratcliff, "Sanctus," who, in keeping with his cavalier attitude to ancient texts, proposes to insert one.

<sup>93</sup>Enrico Mazza, *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1995), 98–176.

<sup>94</sup>A. Stewart-Sykes, *The Lamb's High Feast* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 194.

<sup>95</sup>P.F. Bradshaw, *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1997), 10–14.

<sup>96</sup>Küppers, "Literarisch theologische Einheit," 19–30.

<sup>97</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 10; Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 18 n.2. Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 11 n.5, disagrees on the grounds that *sanitatem* appears later in the prayer.

<sup>98</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 10; Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 18 n.3; Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 11 n.6; Tateo, *Ippolito*, 89. Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 125, preserves "using."

<sup>99</sup>As suggested by Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 74, and by Andrew McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 104–5, 115–17. McGowan notes the appearance of oil at several reports of sacral meals apart from those of *Apostolic Tradition*.

<sup>100</sup>Suggested by S. Agrelo, "Leche y miel: notas de teología bautismal," *Antoni-anum*, 55 (1980), 362–3. Part of the problem with Agrelo's case is that he sees the epiclesis as the specific blessing of bread and wine within the anaphora.

<sup>101</sup>So Cuming, "Eucharist," 51.

<sup>102</sup>Eric Segelberg, "The benedictio olei in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus," *Oriens Christianus*, 48 (1964), 268–81.

<sup>103</sup>Commentary on Daniel, 4.30.

<sup>104</sup>J. M. Hanssens, *La liturgie d'Hippolyte: ses documents, son titulaire, ses origines et son caractère* (Rome: Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies, 1959), 422–4. The most reliable report is that of Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 49.1.

<sup>105</sup>Hanssens, *Liturgie*, 424.

<sup>106</sup>Cuming, "Eucharist," 51.

<sup>107</sup>Cf. McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists*, 106, reckons that a cuisine of cheese with bread necessarily excludes the use of wine and the offering of sacrifice and, in view of the similarity both of this prayer and the practice to the beliefs and practices of the artotyrites, implies that this is an independent strand, thereby questioning the unity of *Apostolic Tradition* and its setting in Rome. To explain this document as enshrining the practices of an immigrant group in Rome sweeps the problem away.



<sup>108</sup>R.H. Connolly, "An Ancient Prayer in the Mediaeval Euchologia," *JTS* 19 (1918), 132-44, at 139.

<sup>109</sup>That this material is traditional is suggested by the appearance of the phrases "sweetness of oil . . . poured from the tree" in prayers for the consecration of oil in three mediaeval sacramentaries. The correspondence is noted by D. van den Eynde, "Nouvelle trace de la Tradition Apostolique d'Hippolyte dans la liturgie Romaine" in *Miscellanea liturgica in honorem L.C. Mohlberg I* (Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 1948), 407-411, at 409-410.

<sup>110</sup>McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists*, 105 n.51, argues that the rubric is secondary on the grounds of the distinction apparently made here between "offering" and "blessing." But in recognizing this rubric, as well as the prayers (105), as "redactional" he has no overarching redactional theory in which to place his insight and implies that *Apostolic Tradition* lacks any cohesion.

<sup>111</sup>E. Lanne, "La bénédiction de l'huile" in A.M. Triacca and A. Pistoia (eds.), *Les bénédictions et les sacramentaux dans la liturgie* (Rome: CLV, 1988), 165-80, at 179.

<sup>112</sup>Jungmann, "Doxologien," 321-6.

<sup>113</sup>Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 65-6.

<sup>114</sup>Dix's edition includes communion prayers which are clearly late, and found only in the Ethiopic version, as chapter 7.

<sup>115</sup>Tidner, *Didascalie*, 128, apparatus ad loc.

<sup>116</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 20, apparatus ad loc.

<sup>117</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 13; Cumming, *Hippolytus*, 12.

<sup>118</sup>Brent, *Hippolytus*, 305.

<sup>119</sup>Tidner, *Didascalie*, 128, apparatus ad loc.

<sup>120</sup>So Dix, *Treatise*, 13.

<sup>121</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 23 n2.

<sup>122</sup>C.H. Turner, "The Ordination Prayer for a Presbyter in the Church Order of Hippolytus," *JTS* 16 (1915), 542-7; Turner cites a parallel from the Gelasian Sacramentary, but the parallel is inexact as it explicitly cites the extent to which the earlier prayer is to be employed.

<sup>123</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 13; D.L. Powell, "The Schism of Hippolytus" in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, 12 (TU 115; Berlin: Akademie, 1975), 449-56, at 451 n.2.

<sup>124</sup>Walls, "Latin version," 159.

<sup>125</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 21 n1.

<sup>126</sup>Brent, *Hippolytus*, 302-6.

<sup>127</sup>Bradshaw, "Participation," 336.

<sup>128</sup>Lécuyer, "Épiscopat et Presbytérat," 46-47.

<sup>129</sup>J.V. Bartlet, "The Ordination Prayers in the Ancient Church Order," *JTS* 17 (1916), 248-56.

<sup>130</sup>Against Noetus, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7.

<sup>131</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 15; Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 23; Cumming, *Hippolytus*, 13.

<sup>132</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 16; Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 25 n.3.

<sup>133</sup>Cumming, *Hippolytus*, 13.

<sup>134</sup>Douglas Powell, "Ordo Presbyterii," *JTS* ns 26 (1975), 290-328, passim. Powell's argument is the basis of Cumming's rendition.

<sup>135</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 16 n.6.

<sup>136</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 18.

<sup>137</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 27; Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 13.

<sup>138</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 18.

<sup>139</sup>See the discussion in A. Stewart-Sykes, "The Seating of Polycarp at Vita Polycarpi 22" in *Studia Patristica*, forthcoming.

<sup>140</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 15, apparatus.

<sup>141</sup>As assumed by A.J. Otterbein, *The Diaconate according to the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus and Derived Documents* (Washington DC: CUA, 1945), 26-7.

<sup>142</sup>Otterbein, *Diaconate*, 18.

<sup>143</sup>Powell, "Ordo Presbyterii," 306-11.

<sup>144</sup>Epictetus, *Discourse*, 3.22.

<sup>145</sup>Ignatius, *Trallians*, 2.3.

<sup>146</sup>See the many texts cited by John Reumann, "'Stewards of God': Pre-Christian Religious Application of *oikonomos* in Greek," *JBL* 77 (1958), 339-49, at 342-3.

<sup>147</sup>Note the evidence presented by Reumann, "'Stewards,'" 345-9.

<sup>148</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 47.

<sup>149</sup>Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 80.

<sup>150</sup>Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 81.

<sup>151</sup>Bradshaw, "Ordination," 38, likewise suspects that the Ethiopic version represents an adaptation of a text closer to that preserved in *Testamentum Domini*.

<sup>152</sup>E.g., as noted in the comment on 2:1 above, Cyprian tells us, at *Letter* 55.8.2, that Cornelius had risen through the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

<sup>153</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 19; Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 14.

<sup>154</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 29 n.3.

<sup>155</sup>Other hints of such a custom are listed by Stam, "Charismatic Theology," 275.

<sup>156</sup>Even though *Apostolic Tradition* was influential in the transition to written eucharistic prayers. See for a discussion of this rubric and the influence of the anaphora at *Apostolic Tradition*, 4, Allan Bouley, *From Freedom to Formula* (Washington DC: CUA, 1981), 118-28.

<sup>157</sup>For further examples note R.P. C. Hanson, "The Liberty of the Bishop to Improvise Prayer in the Eucharist," *VigChr* 15 (1961), 173-6.

<sup>158</sup>Note e.g. Suetonius, *Augustus*, 84. Quintilian (*Instituto Oratoria* 4.1.54) suggests that a written speech may be given an extempore exordium in order to make the entire speech appear improvised.

<sup>159</sup>The chapter numbering of Botte and Dix is retained for ease of reference, but the chapters are printed in the order in which they are found in the Sahidic, which seems more rational and is more probably in accordance with the original than the order in which these chapters are found in the Ethiopic version, which is that followed by Dix and Botte. Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, XXX, shows the order in which the various versions include these chapters.

<sup>160</sup>So P.F. Bradshaw, *Ordination Rites of the Ancient Churches of East and West* (New York: Pueblo, 1990), 93.

<sup>161</sup>See the discussion by E. Ferguson, "Selection and Installation to Office in Roman, Greek, Jewish and Christian Antiquity," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 30 (1974), 273-84.

<sup>162</sup>Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 84–5. He has reference to the report of the staffing of the Roman church at Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 6.43.11.

<sup>163</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 55. Apart from this being the time at which the restriction is first met, Jungklaus further points out that this is also the first time, apart from *Apostolic Tradition*, that the subdiaconate is met (*Gemeinde*, 66).

<sup>164</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 21.

<sup>165</sup>Dix, *Treatise* 22, apparatus.

<sup>166</sup>Among others note the accounts of healing due to visions of Saint Therapon in the *Encomium of Saint Therapon*, 20–1, and in the *Acts of Saint Cyrus and Saint John*, 14, 69, discussed by Mary Hamilton, *Incubation* (St Andrews: Henderson, 1906), 109–58. Incubation and dreaming in the Temple of Aesculapius was a common means of seeking a cure among contemporary pagans on which see in particular Aelius Aristides' account of such visions in his *hieroi logoi*.

<sup>167</sup>Thus see the comment on 41:2–3 below.

<sup>168</sup>Thus note that, at an even later period than that of *Apostolic Tradition*, Cyprian takes dreams and visions as signs from God in the decisions he must make as bishop (e.g., *Letters*, 16.4.1, 39.1.2).

<sup>169</sup>Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 15.

<sup>170</sup>This is the classic Protestant understanding of the rise of ordained leadership and the decline of charismata in the early church, recently given particular expression with regard to second century Rome by James S. Jeffers, *Conflict at Rome: Social Order and Hierarchy in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991). Similarly James L. Ash, "The Decline of Ecstatic Prophecy in the Early Church," *Theological Studies*, 37 (1976), 227–52 argues that episcopacy supplanted prophecy, whereas it is clear from *Apostolic Tradition* that the two phenomena co-existed.

<sup>171</sup>In line with the suggestion of Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 33 n.2.

<sup>172</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 33 and 81–2.

<sup>173</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 32, apparatus.

<sup>174</sup>Cf. both Dix, *Treatise*, 23 and Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 33 n.5, who reckon that *Testamentum Domini* omits this question. It is, however, separated from the second by a considerable expansion.

<sup>175</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 131; Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 41; Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 32; Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 15; Dix, *Treatise*, 23; Tateo, *Ippolito*, 101.

<sup>176</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 131; Dix, *Treatise*, 24; Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 35 n.2; Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 15; Tateo, *Ippolito*, 102.

<sup>177</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 81–2.

<sup>178</sup>*Acts of Justin*, 3.3.

<sup>179</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 51–2.

<sup>180</sup>*Refutation*, 9.12.1.

<sup>181</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 25 n.10. The Sahidic seems most complete and most likely to reflect the original.

<sup>182</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 37 n.4.

<sup>183</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 37 n.5.

<sup>184</sup>Note the discussion of eunuchs in sex of P. Guyot, *Eunuchen als Sklaven und Freigelassene in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Stuttgarter Beiträge zur Geschichte und Politik 14; Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1980), 59–66.

<sup>185</sup>B. Botte, "Psellistēs – psalistēs," *Revue des Etudes Byzantines*, 16 (1958), 162–5.

<sup>186</sup>Tateo, *Ippolito*, 104.

<sup>187</sup>Chadwick at Dix, *Treatise*, m.

<sup>188</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 28.

<sup>189</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 91.

<sup>190</sup>Especially by contrast to Tertullian's rigid attitude, at *On Idolatry*, 10; there an entire chapter is devoted to the evils of schoolmastering.

<sup>191</sup>So Stewart-Sykes, "Hermas the Prophet."

<sup>192</sup>Note the evidence collected by Michael Grant, *Gladiators* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), 25–34.

<sup>193</sup>Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 87.

<sup>194</sup>See on this John Helgeland, Robert J. Daley, J. Patout Burns, *Christians and the Military* (London: SCM, 1987), 35–8 in the context of a wider discussion of early Christian attitudes to military service.

<sup>195</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 49.

<sup>196</sup>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum VI, 7982.

<sup>197</sup>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum I(2), 729, the inscription on the tomb of Publius Quinctius, a freedman copyist, records a wife and a concubine who was his freedwoman, both of whom are counted as members of his family. Marcus Aurelius, according to *Historia Augusta*, did not remarry in order not to put his children under a stepmother.

<sup>198</sup>*Refutation*, 9.12.24.

<sup>199</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 23; Dix, *Treatise*, 28.

<sup>200</sup>*Acts of Peter*, 19. The house is a domestic building which Marcellus sets apart for the use of the church through a sprinkling of holy water.

<sup>201</sup>Till and Leipoldt, *Koptische Text*, 15 n.2.

<sup>202</sup>Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 17.

<sup>203</sup>See the discussion of independent teachers in Roman Christianity in the introduction.

<sup>204</sup>Such is the understanding of Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 88. See also the comment at 27.1 below.

<sup>205</sup>The term, or one of its cognates, occurs sixty times in Hermas' work. See the discussion, with references, in N. Brox, *Der Hirt des Hermas* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1991), 551–3.

<sup>206</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 31.

<sup>207</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 43 n.7.

<sup>208</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 30.

<sup>209</sup>For an English version of the relevant portions of the Gelasian Sacramentary, see E.C. Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy* 2nd edn. (London: SPCK, 1970), 166–96; for a brief discussion, see G.G. Willis, *A History of the Early Roman Liturgy* (London: Henry Bradshaw Society, 1994), 116–36.

<sup>210</sup>Egeria, *Pilgrimage*, 45.1.

<sup>211</sup>Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 86; E.C. Whitaker, "Baptism" in G.J. Cuming (ed.), *Essays on Hippolytus* (Bramcote: Grove, 1978), 52–60, at 53.

<sup>212</sup>So Alistair Stewart-Sykes, "Manumission and Baptism in Tertullian's Africa,"

*Studia Liturgica*, forthcoming.

<sup>213</sup>Theodotus, at Clement, *Excerpts from Theodotus*, 83.

<sup>214</sup>See the comment on 21.5 below.

<sup>215</sup>Elizabeth A. Leeper, "From Alexandria to Rome: The Valentinian Connection to the Incorporation of Exorcism as a Prebaptismal Rite," *VigChr* 44 (1990), 6–24.

<sup>216</sup>Augustine, *Letter* 54.10.

<sup>217</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 31.

<sup>218</sup>Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 17 n.20.

<sup>219</sup>Tertullian, *On Baptism*, 20.

<sup>220</sup>Note the discussion in Brent, *Hippolytus*, 63–9.

<sup>221</sup>For an English version of John the Deacon's letter to Scenarius, see Whitaker, *Documents*, 154–8 with Whitaker's comments on the *effeta* formula at 158.

<sup>222</sup>So H. Riesenfeld, "Sabbat et jour du Seigneur" in A. J. B. Higgins (ed.), *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1958), 210–17.

<sup>223</sup>Cf. the comments of Whitaker, "Baptism," 55, who, whilst noting that the language here does not imply the presence of those other than the candidates, suggests that the Easter Vigil is being described.

<sup>224</sup>Also followed by Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 45 n.2, whose reasoning, albeit expressed slightly curtly, is much as that here.

<sup>225</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 33.

<sup>226</sup>So F. C. Burkitt, "On the Baptismal Rite in the Canons of Hippolytus," *JTS* 1 (1900), 279.

<sup>227</sup>Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 46; Dix, *Treatise*, 35.

<sup>228</sup>Till and Leipoldt, *Koptische Text*, 19 n3.

<sup>229</sup>R. H. Connolly, "On the Text of the Baptismal Creed of Hippolytus," *JTS* 25 (1924), 131–9, at 133.

<sup>230</sup>On both points we follow here the discussion of Connolly, "Text," 137.

<sup>231</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 49 n.2.

<sup>232</sup>Whitaker, "Baptism," 58.

<sup>233</sup>B. Botte, "Note sur le symbole baptismal de saint Hippolyte," *Mélanges Joseph de Ghellink*, I (Gembloux: Duculot, 1951), 189–200, in summary at 197.

<sup>234</sup>D. L. Holland, "The Baptismal Interrogation Concerning the Holy Spirit in Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*" in E. L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, 10 (TU 107; Berlin: Akademie, 1970), 360–5, at 362.

<sup>235</sup>Holland, "Baptismal Interrogation," 363–5.

<sup>236</sup>Botte, "Note," 197–8.

<sup>237</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 51 n.3.

<sup>238</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 38.

<sup>239</sup>Tidner, *Didascalie*, 131, apparatus ad loc.

<sup>240</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 38, apparatus.

<sup>241</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 53 n.1.

<sup>242</sup>Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 20.

<sup>243</sup>G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*, 2nd edn. (London: SPCK, 1967), 141.

<sup>244</sup>Lampe, *Seal*, 141.

<sup>245</sup>A. Gelston, "A Note on the Text of the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus," *JTS* ns 39 (1988), 112-17.

<sup>246</sup>So G. Cuming, "Post-Baptismal Prayer in *Apostolic Tradition*: Further Considerations," *JTS* ns 39 (1988), 117-19, at 118.

<sup>247</sup>Cuming, "Post-Baptismal Prayer in *Apostolic Tradition*."

<sup>248</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 40.

<sup>249</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 55 n.2.

<sup>250</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 41; Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 57; Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 21.

<sup>251</sup>Thus, for instance, I have argued in *The Lamb's High Feast* that Melito's *On Pascha* is simultaneously a prose-hymn, a prayer and a discourse.

<sup>252</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 57 n.3.

<sup>253</sup>Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 21 n.2.

<sup>254</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 59 n.1, and apparatus ad loc.

<sup>255</sup>Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 95.

<sup>256</sup>J. D.C. Fisher, "The Consecration of Water in the Early Rite of Baptism" in K. Aland and F.L. Cross (eds.), *Studia Patristica*, 2 (TU 64; Berlin: Akademie, 1957), 41-6, at 42.

<sup>257</sup>So likewise Whitaker, "Baptism," 56.

<sup>258</sup>Since Cyprian, *Letter* 70.1.3, writes of the manner in which blessing from the bishop inheres in the water. If the water were flowing, the blessing would presumably flow out with the water!

<sup>259</sup>R.J. Zwi Werblowsky, "On the Baptismal Rite according to St. Hippolytus" in K. Aland and F.L. Cross (eds.), *Studia Patristica*, 2 (TU 64; Berlin: Akademie, 1957), 93-105, at 97.

<sup>260</sup>On *tutores* and their responsibilities, including a definition of agnatic relationship and the independent ability of minors to make stipulations, note Justinian *Institutes* 1.13-21.

<sup>261</sup>See J. Jeremias, *Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries* (London: SCM, 1960), 75-80.

<sup>262</sup>W.C. Van Unnik, "Les cheveux défaits des femmes baptisées," *VigChr* 1 (1947), 77-100.

<sup>263</sup>Werblowsky, "Baptismal rite," 99-100.

<sup>264</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 47 n.5.

<sup>265</sup>So Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 47 n.7.

<sup>266</sup>Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 91.

<sup>267</sup>So J. Albert Harrill, "The Influence of Roman Contract Law on Early Baptismal Formulae" in *Studia Patristica*, forthcoming.

<sup>268</sup>Lampe, *Seal*, 143-6.

<sup>269</sup>Lampe, *Seal*, 144.

<sup>270</sup>Using an aorist participle, *anabas*.

<sup>271</sup>*Commentary on Daniel*, 1.16.3.

<sup>272</sup>Aidan Kavanagh, *Confirmation: Origins and Reform* (New York: Pueblo, 1988), 8, 42-52.

<sup>273</sup>Cf. E.J. Christiansen, "Women and Baptism," *Studia Theologica*, 35 (1981), 1-8, who interprets this gesture as a welcome, necessitated by the fact that baptism takes

place outside the main assembly. The welcome, however, is not necessary, since the prayers are followed by the kiss of peace.

<sup>274</sup>One might also compare the *missa* of the catechumens at 19.1.

<sup>275</sup>Stewart-Sykes, "Manumission and Baptism."

<sup>276</sup>Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 20.

<sup>277</sup>Cyprian, *Letter* 73.6, 9.

<sup>278</sup>Cf. E.C. Ratcliff, "Justin Martyr and Confirmation," *Theology*, 6 (1948), 133–9, who wants to see here some kind of post-baptismal ceremony intended to convey the gifts of the Spirit.

<sup>279</sup>Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 21.

<sup>280</sup>E. Mazza, *The Celebration of the Eucharist* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1999), 119. A similar point was made by C.H. Turner, "Adversaria Patristica," *JTS* 7 (1906), 590–605 at 595–7.

<sup>281</sup>Ephrem, *Against Heresies*, 47.1.

<sup>282</sup>Note the discussion, with examples, of McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists*, 110–15.

<sup>283</sup>On which see the comment on verse 30 below.

<sup>284</sup>For an English version of this text, see Whitaker, *Documents*, 153–4.

<sup>285</sup>For discussion see McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists*, 152–3.

<sup>286</sup>Cited by Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 94–5.

<sup>287</sup>Erik Peterson, "MERIS: Hostienpartikel und Opferanteil" in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Rome: Herder, 1959), 97–106 at 99.

<sup>288</sup>So McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists*, 110.

<sup>289</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, XXXII.

<sup>290</sup>Note the comment on 13.1 above. Cf. Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 76, who imagines not only a dismissal of the catechumens but a closing of the doors.

<sup>291</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 59 n.5.

<sup>292</sup>Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 96; he has support from Dikran Y. Hadidian, "The Lord's Prayer and the Sacraments of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper in the Early Church," *Studia Liturgica*, 15 (1982–3), 132–44, at 135.

<sup>293</sup>There is no title in any version.

<sup>294</sup>So Dix, *Treatise*, 43, Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 61 n.2; cf. Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 22, who notes the evidence for Christian gatherings on Saturday, whilst failing to note that none of it is Roman. Indeed, in a later period, Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History* 5.22, considers Roman Christians unusual because they do not celebrate the Eucharist on Saturday.

<sup>295</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 61 n.3.

<sup>296</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 44.

<sup>297</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 44; Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 61 n.5.

<sup>298</sup>Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 58.

<sup>299</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 82–83. See further the comment on verse 2 below.

<sup>300</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 82–83.

<sup>301</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 82.

<sup>302</sup>L. Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis* I (Paris: Ernest Thorin, 1886), 139 n.2.

<sup>303</sup>According to Duchesne (*ibidem*) a connection between this practice and that

of the *fermentum* was suggested by "M de Rossi" in "Bull. 1864 p58 and 1866 p20," references which I am unable to pursue.

<sup>304</sup>It is mentioned by Irenaeus, quoted by Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 5.24.

<sup>305</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 83.

<sup>306</sup>The fragment may be found in Connolly, "Ancient Prayer," 138.

<sup>307</sup>*Didache*, 8.1.

<sup>308</sup>Tertullian, *On Fasting*, 10.

<sup>309</sup>Chapter 33 below does not specify a time-period. On the diversity of practice see Irenaeus quoted by Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 5.24.12.

<sup>310</sup>Tertullian, *On Fasting*, 1.

<sup>311</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 49.

<sup>312</sup>Duensing, *Aethiopische Text*, 73.

<sup>313</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 62; Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 23.

<sup>314</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 63 nn.3-4.

<sup>315</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 49.

<sup>316</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 49.

<sup>317</sup>So Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 23 n.2.

<sup>318</sup>It is also possible that chapter 34 concerns the carrying of gifts of food.

<sup>319</sup>The Ethiopic text reads "cup" here. See the discussion of the text and translation.

<sup>320</sup>Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 59.

<sup>321</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 67 n.1.

<sup>322</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 52.

<sup>323</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 65 n.2.

<sup>324</sup>Mishnah, *Berakoth*, 7.3.

<sup>325</sup>J. Heinemann, "Birkath ha-zimmun and Havurah Meals," *JJS* 13 (1962), 23-9.

<sup>326</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 106.

<sup>327</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 63 n.1.

<sup>328</sup>P.F. Bradshaw, "Other Acts of Worship" in G.J. Cuming (ed.), *Essays on Hippolytus* (Bramcote: Grove, 1978), 61-3, at 62-3.

<sup>329</sup>B. Bokser *The Origins of the Seder* (Berkeley: University of California, 1984), 43-4 and references.

<sup>330</sup>Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 24.

<sup>331</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 67.

<sup>332</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 67 n.9.

<sup>333</sup>Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 24 n.3.

<sup>334</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 20.

<sup>335</sup>A similar suggestion is cautiously made by Dix, *Treatise*, 45.

<sup>336</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 67 n.8.

<sup>337</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 110; Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 69 n.3.

<sup>338</sup>This is observable since the statement that "that is not the eucharist" is translated slightly differently on the two occasions on which it appears.

<sup>339</sup>So Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 106; Hanssens, *Liturgie*, 146-7.

<sup>340</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 106-11.

<sup>341</sup>Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London: Dacre, 1945), 82-5.



<sup>342</sup>Reading "and eat with such of the faithful as are present" (Dix 26.1c). It is possible that this has been constructed from 25.1.

<sup>343</sup>Bradshaw, "Other Acts," 62-3.

<sup>344</sup>Note the discussion at Mishnah, *Berakoth*, 8. The possible connection is noticed by Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 109.

<sup>345</sup>Mishnah, *Berakoth*, 6.6.

<sup>346</sup>This at least is the most common understanding. The original statement is probably that of R.D. Middleton, "The Eucharistic Prayers of the *Didache*," *JTS* 36 (1935), 259-67.

<sup>347</sup>So Dix, *Shape*, 84.

<sup>348</sup>Bradshaw, "Other Acts."

<sup>349</sup>R. Beckwith *Daily and Weekly Worship: From Jewish to Christian* (Bramcote: Grove, 1987), 36.

<sup>350</sup>Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 25.

<sup>351</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 97; Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 69 n.2.

<sup>352</sup>So Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 100; he suggests alternatively that the catechumens stood.

<sup>353</sup>Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 42.4.5.

<sup>354</sup>Pliny, *Letters*, 2.6; Martial, *Epigrams*, 3.60.

<sup>355</sup>Hanssens, *Liturgie*, 489-91 presents ample evidence of the use of this Greek term in Italy in the fourth century, the period of this translation.

<sup>356</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 71; Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 25; Tateo, *Ippolito*, 121.

<sup>357</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 140, understands *protrepō* to apply to the bishop's discourse, but then reckons that the bishop asks the questions. This is a combination of the readings subsequently espoused by Dix and Botte, though it is difficult to understand the manner in which the procedure described by Jungklaus would operate.

<sup>358</sup>Peterson, "MERIS," 105-6, also notes the possible connection with the *fermentum*, though he explains the practice through the common practice of taking away part of a sacrifice. Whereas there is lexical support for his argument, particularly in his observation of the use of the word *apophorēton* to refer to this practice, he does not take account of the manner in which Christians in this period avoided the use of sacrificial vocabulary and foods, whereas the social contexts of pagan and Christian meals are very close.

<sup>359</sup>See references at e.g., Martial, *Epigrams*, 3.3, 4.26, 8.42, 9.100.

<sup>360</sup>For further discussion of this chapter as exemplifying patronage, though with some differences of emphasis, see C. Bobertz, "The Role of Patron in the Cena Dominica of Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*," *JTS* ns 44 (1993), 170-84.

<sup>361</sup>This is the title in the Sahidic version; see the comment on text and translation which makes this title suspect.

<sup>362</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 73 n.3.

<sup>363</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 73 nn.4-6.

<sup>364</sup>*Apology*, 39.

<sup>365</sup>See the discussion, with examples, at Jane F. Gardner and Thomas Wiedemann, *The Roman Household* (London: Routledge, 1991), 140-42.

<sup>366</sup>For details of this practice see Bobertz, "Role," 175-6 and his references.

<sup>367</sup>According to Cornelius, cited by Eusebius at *Ecclesiastical History*, 6.43.12, there were fifteen-hundred widows and poor persons supported by the church.

<sup>368</sup>Lampe, *Stadtrömischen Christen*, 337-9.

<sup>369</sup>Sahidic title. It is possible, as Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 79 n.1, suggests, that this title has become exchanged with that of 32.

<sup>370</sup>See Connolly, "Ancient prayer," 132-7 for a text and some discussion.

<sup>371</sup>So, with reference to the prayer beginning *hanc igitur*, Willis, *History*, 44.

<sup>372</sup>Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 26; he cites Mishnah, *Maaseroth*, 1.2-3.

<sup>373</sup>McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists*, 126-7. The similarity is also observed by J.B. Bauer, "Die Fruchtsegnung in Hippolyts Kirchenordnung," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 74 (1952), 71-5, at 72-3.

<sup>374</sup>Babylonian Talmud, *Berakoth*, 4, 8A, cited by Bauer, "Fruchtsegnung," 72-3.

<sup>375</sup>Suetonius, *Life of Augustus*, 77.

<sup>376</sup>Note the discussion of the social location of these vegetables by D. Brothwell and P. Brothwell, *Food in Antiquity* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1969), 124-7.

<sup>377</sup>Bauer, "Fruchtsegnung," 72; Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 26.

<sup>378</sup>Pliny, *Natural History*, 19.67.

<sup>379</sup>McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists*, 126-7.

<sup>380</sup>Observed by Bauer, "Fruchtsegnung," 74.

<sup>381</sup>Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 102.

<sup>382</sup>Pliny, *Natural History*, 21.5.

<sup>383</sup>Note the brief discussion of L. Friedlaender, *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*, II (ETr) (New York: Dutton, 1913), 150-1.

<sup>384</sup>McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists*, 126.

<sup>385</sup>Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 101.

<sup>386</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 56.

<sup>387</sup>*Didascalia* 21.

<sup>388</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 81 n.2.

<sup>389</sup>So G. Rouwhorst, "The Origins and Evolution of Early Christian Pentecost" in *Studia Patristica*, forthcoming. Cf. Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 81 n.1, who suggests that the feast might be intended.

<sup>390</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 81 n.3.

<sup>391</sup>A. Stewart-Sykes, *Melito of Sardis: On Pascha* (Crestwood NY: SVS Press, 2000), xx.

<sup>392</sup>So Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 87-8.

<sup>393</sup>Theodoret, *Eranistes*, 173.

<sup>394</sup>As assumed by Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 37, and Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 102.

<sup>395</sup>Note, e.g., Pliny's account of his visit to Corellius Rufus (*Letter*, 1.8).

<sup>396</sup>Although the Greek is not extant Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 81 n.4, plausibly suggests that it is *parakalein*.

<sup>397</sup>Suetonius (*Tiberius*, 11) records that Tiberius, whilst on Rhodes, expressed a wish to visit some of the sick on the island. Unfortunately his intention was misunderstood and the entire sick population of the island was brought to his villa!

<sup>398</sup>Pliny (*Letter*, 2.20) tells the tale of Regulus, who was an assiduous visitor of the sick in the interest of gaining legacies.

<sup>399</sup>So Tacitus, *Agricola*, 43.

<sup>400</sup>At this point the work of <sup>R</sup>El and that of <sup>R</sup>CN diverge. See the introduction 32–36 for further details. As suggested there, we give <sup>R</sup>El's conclusion first.

<sup>401</sup>Published by Marcel Richard, "Quelques fragments des pères anténicéens et nicéens," *Symbolae Osloenses*, 38 (1963), 76–83, at 79.

<sup>402</sup>Tertullian, *To his Wife*, 2.5.

<sup>403</sup>J.M. Frochisse, "A propos des origines du jeûne eucharistique," *RHE* 28 (1932), 594–609, at 599–602.

<sup>404</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 21; Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 60–1.

<sup>405</sup>See the discussion on chapter 40 below for evidence of the Roman origin of these provisions.

<sup>406</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 84–5.

<sup>407</sup>Connolly, "So-called Egyptian Church Order," 77–83.

<sup>408</sup>Tertullian, *To his Wife*, 2.5.

<sup>409</sup>Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 61.

<sup>410</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 84–85.

<sup>411</sup>The consignation is not wordless, and is performed by a priest, but the rite is nonetheless similar. The texts may be found at H.W. Codrington, "The Syrian Liturgies of the Presanctified," *JTS* 4 (1903), 69–81, 5 (1904), 369–377, 535–545.

<sup>412</sup>Cf. Dix, *Treatise*, 84; "only so" (with reference to private communion in the home) "can the precautions against mice, etc. be reasonably interpreted." There is no reason why the house church in which the Hippolytean community met should be free of mice.

<sup>413</sup>So Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 60, Dix, *Treatise*, 59; the Latin is *effundere*, the word used in the Latin versions of the Last Supper.

<sup>414</sup>There is no title in any version. On the numbering and order of the chapters here see the introduction 32–36.

<sup>415</sup>B. Botte, "Un passage difficile de la 'Tradition apostolique' sur le signe de croix," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, 27 (1960), 5–19, at 8–9.

<sup>416</sup>Tertullian, *On the Chaplet*, 3.

<sup>417</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 85–6. The work was shown not to be Hippolytean by Cantalamessa, *Omelia*.

<sup>418</sup>There is no title or chapter division in the Sahidic version, though the Arabic version, followed by the Ethiopic, employs the opening phrase as a title.

<sup>419</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 87 n.2.

<sup>420</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 60.

<sup>421</sup>Noticed by Bradshaw, "Other Acts," 62.

<sup>422</sup>Bradshaw, "Other Acts," 62.

<sup>423</sup>Bradshaw, "Other Acts," 62.

<sup>424</sup>So Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 87 n.3.

<sup>425</sup>Connolly, *So-called Egyptian Church Order*, 116–19.

<sup>426</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, xxxvi.

<sup>427</sup>For a discussion see T.J. Harrington, "The Local Church at Rome in the Second Century: A Common Cemetery Emerges amid Developments in this 'Laboratory of Christian Policy,'" *Studia Canonica*, 23 (1989), 167–88.

<sup>428</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 89 n.2.

<sup>429</sup>Leipoldt in Till and Leipoldt, *Koptische Text*, 37 n.2.

<sup>430</sup>Jungklaus, *Gemeinde*, 146; Dix, *Treatise*, 63; Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 91 n.2; Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 55; Tateo, *Ippolito*, 130.

<sup>431</sup>Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 29.

<sup>432</sup>L.E. Phillips, "Daily Prayer in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus," *JTS* ns 40 (1989), 389-400, at 393-4.

<sup>433</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 91 n.5.

<sup>434</sup>Discussed by Connolly at "Ancient prayer," 138.

<sup>435</sup>So Easton, *Apostolic Tradition*, 56; Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 95 n.1; Dix, *Treatise*, 66 prefers to read *spiritum*, in the belief that the Sahidic text is confused. See however the comment below.

<sup>436</sup>See e.g. Tertullian, *On Baptism*, 20.

<sup>437</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 95; Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 30.

<sup>438</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 95 n.5.

<sup>439</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 85.

<sup>440</sup>Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 29.

<sup>441</sup>Tertullian, *On Prayer*, 13.

<sup>442</sup>Cf. here the comments of R.A. Kydd, *Charismatic Gifts in the Early Church* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1984), 59 who believes that this passage refers to the continuing practice of prophecy; that Kydd should be able to read the passage in that way is an indication of the success of the rhetorical strategy. Similarly, whereas Novatian seems to imply that prophets are still active in the Roman church at *On the Trinity* 29.10, the catalogue of spiritual gifts which is found here seems too close to that of Paul to be admissible as evidence that these spiritual gifts were still known in the Roman church.

<sup>443</sup>Epictetus, *Discourses*, 1.4.16; Martial, *Epigrams*, 1.117.17. See also the brief discussion by William Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), 222-5.

<sup>444</sup>Mishnah, *Berakoth*, 4:3; Tosefta, *Berakoth*, 2:6, 2:13.

<sup>445</sup>Phillips, "Daily Prayer," 393-4.

<sup>446</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 91 n.6.

<sup>447</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 93 n.1.

<sup>448</sup>Connolly, "Ancient prayer," 138.

<sup>449</sup>Bradshaw, "Other Acts," 61.

<sup>450</sup>Tertullian, *On Prayer*, 25.

<sup>451</sup>Phillips, "Daily Prayer," 395.

<sup>452</sup>Tertullian, *To his Wife*, 2.

<sup>453</sup>So Phillips, "Daily prayer," 397.

<sup>454</sup>H. Chadwick, "Prayer at Midnight," in *Epektasis* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972), 48-9.

<sup>455</sup>Phillips, "Daily Prayer," 397.

<sup>456</sup>*Against Noetus*, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7.

<sup>457</sup>Bradshaw, "Other Acts," 61-2; Phillips, "Daily Prayer," 398-9.

<sup>458</sup>For more extensive discussions of this conflation and its possible origin, see

Dikran Y. Hadidian, "The Background and Origin of the Christian Hours of Prayer," *Theological Studies*, 25 (1964), 59–69 and P.F. Bradshaw, *Daily Prayer in the Early Church* (London: SPCK, 1981), 1–71.

<sup>459</sup>There is no title or chapter division in any version.

<sup>460</sup>Dix, *Treatise* 68, apparatus.

<sup>461</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique* 98, apparatus.

<sup>462</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 101 n.1.

<sup>463</sup>Tidner, *Didascalie*, 149 and apparatus ad loc.

<sup>464</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 71.

<sup>465</sup>Dix, *Treatise*, 72; Cuming, *Hippolytus*, 31.

<sup>466</sup>The emendation is that of Dix, *Treatise*, 72.

<sup>467</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 103 n.3.

<sup>468</sup>Botte, *Tradition Apostolique*, 103 n.3.

<sup>469</sup>Connolly, *So-called Egyptian Church Order*, 163 n.3.

<sup>470</sup>*Refutation* 4.46 and 7.13. This is observed by Connolly, *So-called Egyptian Church Order*, 163. Although J. Magne, *Tradition Apostolique sur les charismes et diataxeis des saints apôtres* (Paris: Private publication, 1975), 74, suggests that this image is not uniquely Hippolytean, (he refers to the occurrences noted by Erik Peterson, "Das Schiff als Symbol der Kirche in der Eschatologie" in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* [Rome: Herder, 1959], 92–96), the usage is noteworthy, nonetheless, given the context, and in the light of the many weighty parallels which have been found in Hippolytean works, which extend not only to the use of the image of a beleaguered ship to represent the church, but to the manner in which the image is employed.

<sup>471</sup>Thus following the discussion of G.G. Blum, "Apostolische Tradition und Sukzession bei Hippolyt," *ZNW* 55 (1964), 95–110.



## Bibliography

### *I: Texts, versions and translations of Apostolic Tradition and related texts (cited by author and short title passim)*

- Botte, B., *La Tradition Apostolique de Saint Hippolyte: Essai de reconstitution* (Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 39; Münster: Aschendorff, 1963).
- Bradshaw, P.F., *The Canons of Hippolytus* (Bramcote: Grove, 1987).
- Cuming, G., *Hippolytus: A Text for Students* (Bramcote: Grove, 1976).
- Dix, G., (H. Chadwick rev.) *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St Hippolytus of Rome* (Ridgefield, CT: Morehouse, 1968).
- Duensing, H., *Der aethiopische Text der Kirchenordnung des Hippolyt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1946).
- Easton, B.S., *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934).
- Horner, G., *The Statutes of the Apostles* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1904).
- Jungklaus, Ernst, *Die Gemeinde Hippolyts* (TU 46.2; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1928).
- Rahmani, I.E., *Testamentum Domini nostri Jesu Christi* (Mainz: Kirchheim, 1899).
- Tateo, Rachele, *Ippolito di Roma: Tradizione Apostolica* (Rome: Paoline, 1972).
- Tidner, E., *Didascaliae apostolorum, canonum ecclesiasticorum, traditionis apostolicae versiones Latinae* (TU 75; Berlin: Akademie, 1963).
- Till, W. and Leipoldt, J., *Der koptische Text der Kirchenordnung Hippolyts* (TU 58; Berlin: Akademie, 1954).

### *II: Works concerning Hippolytus and Apostolic Tradition*

- Agrelo, S., "Leche y miel. Notas de teología bautismal," *Antonianum*, 55 (1980), 352-67.

- Bartlet, J.V., "The Ordination Prayers in the Ancient Church Order," *Journal of Theological Studies* 17 (1916), 248-56.
- Bauer, J.B., "Die Fruchtsegnung in Hippolyts Kirchenordnung," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 74 (1952), 71-5.
- Blanc, J., "Lexique comparé des versions de la 'Tradition apostolique' de S. Hippolyte," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, 22 (1955), 173-92.
- Blum, G.G., "Apostolische Tradition und Sukzession bei Hippolyt," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 55 (1964), 95-110.
- Robertz, Charles, "The Role of Patron in the *Cena Dominica* of Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*," *Journal of Theological Studies* ns 44 (1995), 170-84.
- Botte, Bernard, "L'epiclèse de l'anaphore d'Hippolyte," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, 14 (1947), 241-51.
- . "L'authenticité de la *Tradition apostolique* de saint Hippolyte," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, 16 (1949), 177-85.
- . "Note sur le symbole baptismal de saint Hippolyte," *Mélanges J. de Ghellink*, I (Gembloux: Duculot, 1951), 189-200.
- . "La texte de la *Tradition apostolique*," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, 22 (1955), 161-72.
- . "Psellistēs - psalistēs," *Revue des Études Byzantines*, 16 (1958), 162-5.
- . "Un passage difficile de la 'Tradition apostolique' sur le signe de croix," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, 27 (1960), 5-19.
- . "A propos de la 'Tradition apostolique,'" *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, 33 (1966), 177-86.
- . "'Extendit manus suas cum pateretur,'" *Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales*, 49 (1968), 307-8.
- Bradshaw, P.F., "Ordination" in G.J. Cuming (ed.), *Essays on Hippolytus* (Bramcote: Grove, 1978), 33-8.
- . "Other Acts of Worship," in G.J. Cuming (ed.), *Essays on Hippolytus* (Bramcote: Grove, 1978), 61-3.
- . "The Participation of Other Bishops in the Ordination of a Bishop in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus," in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, 18 (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1989), 335-7.
- . "Redating the *Apostolic Tradition*: Some Preliminary Steps," in J. Baldovin and Nathan Mitchell (eds.), *Rule of Prayer, Rule of Faith* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1996), 3-17.



- Brent, Allen, *Hippolytus and the Roman Church in the Third Century: Communities in Tension before the Emergence of a Monarch-Bishop* (VigChr Supp 31; Leiden: Brill, 1995).
- Casel, Odo, "Die Kirchenordnung Hippolyts von Rom," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 2 (1952), 115–30.
- Chadwick, H., "Prayer at Midnight," in J. Fontaine and C. Kannengiesser (eds.), *Epektasis* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972), 48–9.
- Christiansen, E.J., "Women and Baptism," *Studia Theologica*, 35 (1981), 1–8.
- Connolly, R.H., *The So-called Egyptian Church Order and Derived Documents* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916).
- . "The Ordination Prayers of Hippolytus," *Journal of Theological Studies* 18 (1917), 55–8.
- . "An Ancient Prayer in the Mediaeval Euchologia," *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1918), 132–44.
- . "The Prologue to the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus," *Journal of Theological Studies* 22 (1921), 356–61.
- . "On the Text of the Baptismal Creed of Hippolytus," *Journal of Theological Studies* 25 (1923–24), 131–9.
- . "The Eucharistic Prayer of Hippolytus," *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1938), 350–69.
- Cuming, G., "The Eucharist" in G.J. Cuming (ed.), *Essays on Hippolytus* (Bramcote: Grove, 1978), 39–51.
- . "The Post-Baptismal Prayer in Apostolic Tradition: Further Considerations," *Journal of Theological Studies* ns 39 (1988), 117–19.
- Elfers, H., "Neue Untersuchungen über die Kirchenordnung Hippolyts," in *Festschrift K. Adam* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1952), 169–211.
- Finn, T.M., "Ritual Process and the Survival of Early Christianity," *Journal of Ritual Studies*, 3 (1989), 69–89.
- Frere, W.H., "Early Ordination Services," *Journal of Theological Studies* 16 (1915), 323–71.
- Gelston, A., "A Note on the Text of the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus," *Journal of Theological Studies* ns 39 (1988), 112–17.
- Goltz, E. von, "Die Taufgeete Hippolyts und andere Taufgebete der alten Kirche," *Zeitschrift für die Kirchengeschichte* 1 (1906), 1–27.
- Grove, Ron, "'Terminum figat': Clarifying the Meaning of a Phrase in the 'Apostolic Tradition,'" *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 48 (1982), 431–4.
- Hanssens, J.M., *La liturgie d'Hippolyte: Ses documents, son titulaire, ses*

- origines et son caractere* (Rome: Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies, 1959).
- . *La liturgie d'Hippolyte: Documents et Études* (Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University, 1970).
- Hennecke, E., "Hippolyts Schrift 'apostolischen Überlieferung über Gnadengaben,'" *Harnack-Ehrung* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1921), 159–82.
- . "Der Prolog zur 'apostolischen Überlieferung,'" *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 22 (1923), 144–6.
- Holland, D.L., "The Earliest Text of the Old Roman Symbol: A Debate with Hans Lietzmann and J.N.D. Kelly," *Church History*, 34 (1965), 262–81.
- Holland, D.L., "The Baptismal Interrogation Concerning the Holy Spirit in Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*" in F.L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, 10 (TU 107; Berlin, Akademie, 1970), 360–5.
- Jungmann, J.A., "Die Doxologien in der Kirchenordnung Hippolyts," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 86 (1964), 321–6.
- Küppers, K., "Die literarisch theologische Einheit von Eucharistiegebet und Bischofsweihegebet bei Hippolyt," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 29 (1987), 19–30.
- Lanne, E., "La bénédiction de l'huile" in A.M. Triacca and A. Pistoia (eds.), *Les bénédictions et les sacramentaux dans la liturgie* (Rome: CLV, 1988), 165–80.
- Lécuyer, Joseph, "Épiscopat et presbytérat dans les écrits d'Hippolyte de Rome," *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, 41 (1953), 30–50.
- . "La prière d'ordination de l'évêque: Le pontifical romain et la 'Tradition apostolique' d'Hippolyte," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 89 (1967), 601–6.
- Lengeling, E.J., "Hippolyt von Rom und die Wendung 'extendit manus suas cum pateretur,'" *Questions Liturgiques*, 50 (1969), 141–4.
- Loi, Vincenzo, "L'Identità letteraria di Ippolyto di Roma," in *Ricerche su Ippolyto* (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 13; Rome: Institutum Augustinianum, 1977), 67–88.
- Magne, Jean, *Tradition Apostolique sur les charismes et diataxeis des saints apôtres* (Paris: Private publication, 1975).
- Markschies, C., "Wer schrieb die sogenannte Traditio Apostolica?: Neue Beobachtungen und Hypothesen zu einer kaum lösbaren Frage aus der altkirchlichen Literaturgeschichte," in W. Kinzig, C. Marksches, and M. Vinzent, *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 1–74.

- Metzger, Marcel, "Nouvelles perspectives pour la prétendue Tradition apostolique," *Ecclesia Orans*, 5 (1988), 241-59.
- . "A propos des règlements ecclésiastiques et de la prétendue Tradition Apostolique," *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, 66 (1992), 249-61.
- . "Enquêtes autour de la prétendue Tradition apostolique," *Ecclesia Orans*, 9 (1992), 7-36.
- Nautin, Pierre, *Hippolyte et Josipe* (Paris: Cerf, 1947).
- Otterbein, A.J., *The Diaconate according to the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus and Derived Documents* (Washington DC: CUA, 1945).
- Pitt, W.E., "Anamnesis and Institution Narrative in the Liturgy of Apostolic Constitutions 8," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 9 (1958), 1-7.
- Phillips, L.E., "Daily Prayer in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus," *Journal of Theological Studies* ns 40 (1989), 389-400.
- Powell, D.L., "The Schism of Hippolytus," in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia patristica*, 12 (TU 115; Berlin: Akademie, 1975), 449-56.
- Ratcliff, E.C., "The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 1 (1950), 29-36, 125-34.
- . "Apostolic Tradition: Questions concerning the Appointment of the Bishop" in F.L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, 8 (TU 93; Berlin: Akademie, 1966), 266-70.
- Richard, Marcel, "Quelques fragments des pères anténicéens et nicéens," *Symbolae Osloenses*, 38 (1963), 76-83.
- Richardson, C.C., "The So-called Epiclesis in Hippolytus," *Harvard Theological Review*, 40 (1947), 101-8.
- . "A Note on the Epicleses in Hippolytus and the Testamentum Domini," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, 15 (1948), 357-9.
- . "The Date and Setting of the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus," *Anglican Theological Review* 30 (1948), 38-44.
- Richter, K., "Zum Ritus der Bischofsordination in der 'Apostolischen Überlieferung' Hippolyts von Rom und der davon abhängigen Schriften," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 17 (1975), 7-51.
- Rordorf, W., "L'ordination de l'évêque selon la tradition apostolique d'Hippolyte de Rome," *Questions liturgiques*, 55 (1974), 137-51.
- Salles, A., "La 'Tradition apostolique' est-elle un témoin de la liturgie romaine?," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 148 (1956), 181-213.
- Saxer, Victor, "Il étendit les mains à l'heure de sa passion: Le thème de

- l'orant-te dans la littérature chrétienne des IIe et IIIe siècles," *Augustinianum*, 20 (1980), 335-65.
- Schwartz, E., "Über die pseudapostolischen Kirchenordnungen," *Schriften der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft im Strassburg*, 6 (1910).
- Segelberg, Eric, "The *benedictio olei* in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus," *Oriens Christianus*, 48 (1964), 268-81.
- . "The Ordination Prayers in Hippolytus" in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, 13 (TU 116; Berlin: Akademie, 1975), 397-408.
- Simonetti, M., "A modo di conclusione: una ipotesi di lavoro" in *Ricerche su Ippolyto* (*Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 13; Rome: Institutum Augustinianum, 1977), 151-6.
- . "Una nuova proposta su Ippolito," *Augustinianum*, 36 (1996), 13-46.
- Smith, M.A., "The Anaphora of Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus Reconsidered," in F.L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, 10 (TU 107; Berlin, Akademie, 1970), 426-30.
- Stam, J.E., *Episcopacy in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus* (Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Kommission, 1969).
- . "Charismatic Theology in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus" in G.F. Hawthorne (ed.), *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 267-76.
- Stewart-Sykes, A., "Hermas the Prophet and Hippolytus the Preacher: The Roman Homily and its Social Context" in Mary B. Cunningham and Pauline Allen (eds.), *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 34-63.
- . "The Integrity of the Hippolytean Ordination Rites," *Augustinianum*, 39 (1999), 97-127.
- Turner, C.H., "The Ordination Prayer for a Presbyter in the Church Order of Hippolytus," *Journal of Theological Studies* 16 (1915), 542-7.
- Van den Eynde, D., "Nouvelle trace de la Tradition Apostolique d'Hippolyte dans la liturgie Romaine," in *Miscellanea liturgica in honorem L.C. Mohlberg I* (Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 1948), 407-411.
- van Unnik, W.C., "Les cheveux défaits des femmes baptisées; un rite de baptême dans l'Ordre Ecclésiastique d'Hippolyte," *Vigiliae Christianae*, 1 (1947), 77-100.
- Walls, A.F., "The Latin Version of Hippolytus' Apostolic Tradition" in F.L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, 3 (TU 78; Berlin: Akademie, 1961), 155-62.

- Werblowsky, R. J. Z., "On the Baptismal Rite according to St Hippolytus" in K. Aland and F. L. Cross (eds.), *Studia Patristica* 2 (TU 64; Berlin: Akademie, 1957) 93-105.
- Whitaker, E. C., "Baptism" in G. J. Cuming (ed.), *Essays on Hippolytus* (Bramcote: Grove, 1978), 52-60.
- Wilmart, A., "Le texte Latin de la paradosis de S Hippolyte," *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, 9 (1919), 62-78.

### III: Other works relevant to the study of Apostolic Tradition

- Ash, James L., "The Decline of Ecstatic Prophecy in the Early Church," *Theological Studies*, 37 (1976), 227-52.
- Bardy, Gustav, "Les Écoles Romaines au second siècle," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 28 (1932), 501-32.
- Bartlet, J. V., *Church-Life and Church-Order during the First Four Centuries* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1943).
- Bouley, Allan, *From Freedom to Formula* (Washington DC: CUA, 1981).
- Bouman, C. A., "Variants in the Introduction to the Eucharistic Prayer," *Vigiliae Christianae*, 4 (1950), 94-115.
- Bradshaw, P. F., *Daily Prayer in the Early Church* (London: SPCK, 1981).
- . *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* (London: SPCK, 1992).
- Burkitt, F. C., "On the Baptismal Rite in the Canons of Hippolytus," *Journal of Theological Studies* 1 (1900), 279.
- Dix, Gregory, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London: Dacre, 1945).
- Fisher, J. D. C., "The Consecration of Water in the Early Rite of Baptism," in K. Aland and F. L. Cross (eds.), *Studia Patristica*, 2 (TU 64; Berlin: Akademie, 1957), 41-6.
- Fréchisse, J. M., "A propos des origines du jeûne eucharistique," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 28 (1932), 594-609.
- Gardner, Jane F. and Wiedemann, Thomas, *The Roman Household* (London: Routledge, 1991).
- Hadidian, Dikran Y., "The Background and Origin of the Christian Hours of Prayer," *Theological Studies*, 25 (1964), 59-69.
- Harrill, J. Albert, "The Influence of Roman Contract Law on Early Baptismal Formulae," *Studia Patristica*, forthcoming.

- Harrington, T.J., "The Local Church at Rome in the Second Century: A Common Cemetery Emerges amid Developments in this 'Laboratory of Christian Policy,'" *Studia Canonica*, 23 (1989) 167–88.
- Jeffers, J., *Conflict at Rome: Social Order and Hierarchy in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991).
- Kavanagh, Aidan, *Confirmation: Origins and Reform* (New York: Pueblo, 1988).
- Lampe, G.W.H., *The Seal of the Spirit*, 2nd edn. (London: SPCK, 1967).
- Lampe, Peter, *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten* (WUNT 2.18; Tübingen: Mohr, 1987).
- Lash, Ephrem, "Sursum Corda: The Meaning of a Dialogue," *Sobornost*, 18 (1996), 19–29.
- Leeper, Elizabeth A., "From Alexandria to Rome: The Valentinian Connection to the Incorporation of Exorcism as a Prebaptismal Rite," *Vigiliae Christianae* 44 (1990), 6–24.
- Maier, Harry O., *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of Hermas, Clement and Ignatius* (Dissertations SR 1; Waterloo ON: Wilfred Laurier, 1991).
- Mazza, Enrico, *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1995).
- McGowan, Andrew, *Ascetic Eucharists* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999).
- Neymeyr, Ulrich, *Die christlichen Lehrer im zweiten Jahrhundert* (*Vigiliae Christianae* Supp 4; Leiden: Brill, 1989).
- Peterson, Erik, "MERIS: Hostienpartikel und Opferanteil," in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Rome: Herder, 1959), 97–106.
- Powell, D.L., "Ordo Presbyterii," *Journal of Theological Studies* ns 26 (1975), 290–328.
- Whitaker, E.C., *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*, 2nd edn. (London: SPCK, 1970).
- Willis, G.G., *A History of the Early Roman Liturgy* (London: Henry Bradshaw Society, 1994).

# Indices

## I: Index of ancient texts (apart from *Apostolic Tradition* and related documents)

### i) Classical texts

Artemidorus		
<i>On the Interpretation of Dreams</i>		
1.76	191	
Epictetus		
<i>Discourses</i>		
1.4.16	204	
3.22	194	
3.26.22	191	
Iamblichus		
<i>On the Pythagorean Way of Life</i>		
17	187	
Justinian		
<i>Institutes</i>		
1.13-21	198	
Lucian		
<i>On Salaried Posts in Great Houses</i>		
14-18	190	
26	190	
Martial		
<i>Epigrams</i>		
1.117	204	
3.3	201	
3.60	201	
4.26	201	
7.86	143	
8.42	201	
9.100	201	
Petronius		
<i>Satyricon</i>		
56-57	145	

Pliny		
<i>Natural History</i>		
19.67	202	
21.5	202	
Pliny junior		
<i>Letters</i>		
1.8	202	
2.6	201	
2.20	202	
Quintilian		
<i>Institutio oratoria</i>		
4.1.54	194	
Suetonius		
<i>Augustus</i>		
77	202	
84	194	
<i>Tiberius</i>		
11	202	
Tacitus		
<i>Agricola</i>		
43	201	

### ii) Jewish and Christian texts

(anon.)		
<i>Acts of Justin</i>		
3.3	195	
<i>Acts of Peter</i>		
19	104, 196	
<i>Acts of Saint Cyrus and Saint John</i>		
14	195	

69	195	55.8.2	58, 194
<i>Didache</i>		70.1.3.	198
8.1	200	73.6.9	123
9	137	<i>On the Lord's Prayer</i>	
<i>Didascalia</i>		31	68
21	202	Egeria	
<i>Encomium of Saint Therapon</i>		<i>Pilgrimage</i>	
20-21	195	45.1	196
<i>Jubilees</i>		Ephrem	
22:6-9	136	<i>Against Heresies</i>	
<i>Life of Polycarp</i>		47.1	125, 199
22	59	Epiphanius	
Ambrose		<i>Panarion</i>	
<i>On the Sacraments</i>		42.2.1-5	187
4.25	125	42.4.5	201
Aristeas		49.1	192
<i>Letter</i>		Eusebius	
184-185	136	<i>Ecclesiastical History</i>	
Augustine		4.23.11	184
<i>Letters</i>		5.23-24	184, 199, 200
54.10	197	6.43	194, 201
Babylonian Talmud		Hermas	
<i>Berakoth</i>		<i>Vision</i>	
4	202	2.2.6	183
8A	202	2.4.2	183
<i>Baba Qama</i>		2.4.3	183, 187, 188
82B	167	3.5.1	186
<i>I Clement</i>		3.10.9	68
1.3	183	<i>Mandate</i>	
21.6	183	10.1.6	68
40	90	11	38, 146, 187
44.5	183	<i>Similitude</i>	
47.6	183	9.9.5	120
Clement of Alexandria		9.15.4	187
<i>Excerpts from Theodotus</i>		9.16.5	187
24.1	97	9.19.2-3	187
83	197	9.27.2	187
Cyprian		Hippolytean school	
<i>Letter</i>		<i>Against Noetus</i>	
16.4.1	195	1	85, 193, 204
39.1.2	195	5	68



10	91	Ignatius	
15	68	<i>Trallians</i>	
17	68	2.3	194
18	68	Irenaeus	
<i>Benediction of Isaac</i>		<i>Against Heresies</i>	
1b	69	1.27.1	190
<i>Benediction of Jacob</i>		1.27.2	187
6	69	3.3.2-3	190
202-204	122	Josephus	
209-211	126	<i>Jewish War</i>	
<i>Commentary on Daniel</i>		2.129-131	136
1.16	198	Justin	
2.30	68	<i>First Apology</i>	
2.32	68	61	124
3.4	68	64	191
3.9	68	65	126
3.24	191	67	93
4.10	70	Mishnah	
4.30	70, 192	<i>Berakoth</i>	
<i>Homily on the Psalms</i>		4.3	204
4	136	6.2	136
12	187	6.6	140, 201
17	187	7.3	200
<i>On the Antichrist</i>		8	201
52	69	<i>Maaseroth</i>	
<i>On the universe</i>		1.2-3	202
fragment;	70	Novatian	
<i>Refutation</i>		<i>On the Trinity</i>	
proem. 6-7		29.10	204
4.46	205	Socrates	
7.13	205	<i>Ecclesiastical history</i>	
9.7	187	5.22	199
9.11	62	Tertullian	
9.12	62, 187, 190, 195,	<i>Against Marcion</i>	
196		1.14	123, 184
9.15	119	4.40	125
10.5	190	<i>Apology</i>	
10.19	187	30	93
10.28-29	91	39	135, 147
10.34		<i>On Idolatry</i>	
		10	196

11	120	<i>On the Chaplet</i>	
<i>On Baptism</i>		3	203
4-4	118	<i>On the Veiling of Virgins</i>	
16	105	17	104
20	197, 204	<i>To his Wife</i>	
<i>On Fasting</i>		2	203, 204
1	200	Theodoret	
10	200	<i>Eranistes</i>	
<i>On Prayer</i>		173	154, 202
13	204	Tosefta	
25	204	<i>Berakoth</i>	
<i>On the Apparel of Women</i>		2:6	204
1.9	120	2:13	204

## II: Index of modern authors

- Agrelo, S., 192  
 Ash, J., 195  
 Bardy, G., 39, 187  
 Bartlett, J. V., 85, 185, 193  
 Bauer, J. B., 150, 202  
 Beckwith, R., 142, 201  
 Blum, G. G., 205  
 Bobertz, C., 201  
 Bokser, B., 200  
 Botte, B., 18, 29, 34, 367-37, 45, 54, 61,  
     66, 67, 68, 69, 73, 76, 82, 83-84,  
     87, 88, 92, 93, 94, 98, 101, 106,  
     115, 116, 117, 118, 121, 127, 128,  
     131, 134, 135, 137, 138, 139, 143,  
     144, 147, 160, 162, 166, 167, 172,  
     173, 184, 185, 186, 188, 189, 190,  
     191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197,  
     198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203,  
     204, 205  
 Bouley, A., 194  
 Bouman, C. A., 68, 191  
 Bouyer, L., 188  
 Bradshaw, P.F., 26, 57-58, 59, 62, 75,  
     83, 140, 142, 162, 169, 170, 183,  
     185, 186, 188, 189, 190, 192, 193,  
     194, 195, 200, 201, 203, 204  
 Brent, A., 12, 15, 20, 24, 25-27, 31, 50, 55,  
     59, 60, 69, 70, 83, 85, 168, 183,  
     184, 185, 186, 188, 189, 190, 191,  
     193, 197  
 Brothwell, D. and P., 202  
 Brox, N., 196  
 Burkitt, F. C., 197  
 Campbell, R. A., 187, 188  
 Cantalamessa, R., 192, 203  
 Chadwick, H., 101, 114, 170, 184, 196,  
     204  
 Christiansen, E.J., 198  
 Codrington, H.W., 203  
 Connolly, R.H., 16, 19, 68, 69, 70, 71,  
     79, 115, 158-159, 163, 169, 173,  
     184, 185, 187, 191, 193, 197, 200,  
     202, 203, 204, 205  
 Culpepper, R.A., 39-40, 187, 188

- Cuming, G., 48, 63, 66, 67, 73, 76, 79,  
82, 87, 88, 92, 94, 98, 101, 105,  
116, 118, 123, 125, 131, 136-137,  
143, 144, 150, 166, 167, 173, 188,  
190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196,  
197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202,  
204, 205
- Dix, G., 15, 30, 46, 48, 54, 60, 62, 65, 66,  
68, 72, 76, 82, 83, 87, 88, 92, 96,  
98, 99, 101, 103, 106, 107, 114,  
115, 116, 117, 118, 121, 128-129,  
131, 132, 135, 136-137, 139, 142,  
144-145, 152, 153, 158-159,  
163-164, 166, 167, 172, 173, 184,  
186, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193,  
194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200,  
201, 202, 203, 204, 205
- Duchesne, L., 129, 199
- Duensing, H., 131, 200
- Easton, B.S., 34, 90, 93, 94, 101, 102, 107,  
118, 121, 127, 134, 151-152,  
158-159, 166, 186, 192, 193, 194,  
195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201,  
202, 203, 204
- Ferguson, E., 194
- Fisher, J.D.C., 119, 198
- Friedlaender, L., 187, 202
- Frochisse, J.M., 157, 203
- Gelston, A., 117, 198
- Goltz, E. von, 16, 184
- Grant, M., 196
- Grove, R., 70, 191
- Guyot, P., 195
- Hadidian, D.Y., 199, 204
- Hamilton, M., 195
- Hanssens, J.M., 17, 78, 184, 185, 192, 201
- Hanson, R.P.C., 194
- Harrill, J.A., 198
- Harrington, T.J., 203
- Harris, W., 204
- Hauler, E., 82, 87, 172
- Heinemann, J., 135, 200
- Helgeland, J., 196
- Hennecke, E., 29, 42, 185, 186, 187, 188
- Holland, D.L., 115, 197
- Hyldahl, N., 185
- Jay, E.G., 183
- Jeffers, J.S., 183, 195
- Jeremias, J., 198
- Jungklaus, E., 29, 34, 90, 93, 98, 101,  
103, 135, 137, 139, 142, 158, 166,  
186, 188, 192, 194, 195, 196, 199,  
200, 201, 202, 203
- Jungmann, J.A., 81, 189, 191, 193
- Kavanagh, A., 123, 198
- Küppers, K., 74, 76, 192
- Kydd, R. A., 204
- Lampe, G., 116, 122, 197, 198
- Lampe, P., 12, 13, 44, 55, 148, 183, 184,  
187, 201
- Lanne, E., 79, 193
- Lash, E., 65, 190
- Lécuyer, J., 84, 190, 193
- Leeper, E., 197
- Leipolt, J., 105, 114, 196, 197, 203
- Lengeling, E.J., 69, 191
- Lightfoot, J.B., 185, 189, 190
- Loi, V., 23, 186
- Magne, J., 185, 187, 205
- Markschies, C., 183, 185
- Maier, H.O., 41, 55, 187, 188
- Mazza, E., 75, 125, 192, 199
- McGowan, A., 79, 126, 150, 151, 192,  
193, 199, 202
- Meeks, W., 188
- Metzger, M., 183, 186
- Middleton, R.D., 201
- Nautin, P., 23-24, 175, 186
- Neymeyr, U., 190
- Otterbein, A.J., 89, 194
- Peterson, E., 126, 199, 201, 205
- Phillips, L.E., 34-35, 166, 168, 169,

- 170, 186, 204  
 Pitt, W.E., 71, 191  
 Powell, D.L., 15, 83, 87, 89, 184, 193, 194  
 Ratcliff, E.C., 57-58, 66, 73, 74, 185, 189, 190, 192, 199  
 Reumann, J., 194  
 Richard, M., 185, 202  
 Richardson, C.C., 67, 73, 183, 191, 192  
 Richter, K., 189  
 Riesenfeld, H., 197  
 Rordorf, W., 189  
 Rouwhorst, G., 202  
 Salles, A., 17-19, 184  
 Saxer, V., 69, 191  
 Schwartz, E., 16, 184  
 Segelberg, E., 185, 192  
 Simonetti, M., 15, 23, 27, 184, 186  
 Stam, J.E., 43, 61, 187, 188, 189, 194  
 Stewart-Sykes, A., 175, 184, 187, 188, 189, 192, 193, 196, 199, 202  
 Tateo, R., 76, 98, 101, 144, 166, 192, 195, 196, 201, 203  
 Tidner, E., 116, 172, 193, 197, 205  
 Till, W., 105, 114, 196, 197  
 Turner, C.H., 82-83, 193, 199  
 Van den Eynde, D., 193  
 Van Unnik, W.C., 198  
 Walls, A., 59-60, 61, 83, 189, 193  
 Werblowsky, R.J.Z., 119-120, 198  
 Whitaker, E.C., 107, 115, 185, 196, 197, 198, 199  
 Willis, G.G., 196, 202  
 Wilmart, A., 34, 186

### III: Subject Index

- Agape, 30, 139-142  
*anamnesis*, 72  
 Anointing  
   baptismal, 18, 116, 122-123  
   of the sick, 67, 132  
   See also: *Effata*, Exorcism  
*Apophoreta*, 133, 144-146  
*Apostolic Tradition*:  
   "Authorship," 21-32  
   Conclusion(s) to, 32-37, 158  
   Date, 12, 17-19  
   Purpose, 38-44, 50  
   Roman origin of, 17-19, 34, 109-110  
   Textual materials, 45-48  
   Title of, 17, 20-22  
 Artotrytes, 78-79  
   See also: cheese  
 Baptism, 17-19  
   at Easter, 110  
   of children, 119-120  
   Jewish origin of, 120  
 baptistries, 18, 119  
*Birkath hamazon*, 141  
 Books, price of, 168  
 Callistus, 15, 23, 24, 40, 42, 55, 93, 99, 163-164  
 Catechumens, catechumenate, 17-19, 40, 104-105, 106-110, 184  
   See also: *disciplina arcani*  
 Cemetery, 34, 163-164  
 Cerdo, 39  
 Cheese, 78-79, 81  
 Clement of Rome, 13

- Concubines, 102–103, 196  
 "Confirmation," 116–117, 122–123, 124  
 Cornelius, 57  
 Cross, sign of, 161  
*Cursus honorum*, 57, 91  
 Deacons, duties of, 28, 89–91, 132, 153, 155  
 Dionysius of Corinth, 15  
*Disciplina arcana*, 105, 127, 143  
*Effeta*, 109  
 Eucharist  
     As meal, 30–31, 77–79, 81, 125–126, 138, 140–142, 143, 157, 159–160  
     As offering, 81, 110  
     Jewish basis of, 31, 139–142  
     reservation of, at home, 31, 158  
     See also: Symposia, and under various foodstuffs  
 Eunuchs, 101  
 Exorcism, 18, 107–108  
 Exorcists (order of), 97  
 Fasting  
     eucharistic, 157  
     general, 130–131  
     paschal, 13–14, 152–154  
     pre-baptismal, 109  
*Fermentum*, 129, 145  
 Flowers, as table decoration, 151  
 Freedmen/women, 89, 103, 143, 196  
*Gelasian Sacramentary*, 19, 107–110, 122, 127  
 Gladiators, 102  
 Hallel psalms, 135–136  
*Hanc igitur*, 202  
 Hairstyles, female, 120  
 Honey: see milk and honey  
 Incubation, 96–97, 195  
 Jewelry, 120  
*Leonine Sacramentary*, 19, 125  
*Lex Julia et Papia*, 95  
 Libations, 160  
*Liber Pontificalis*, 129  
 Liberian catalogue, 14  
 Lilies: see flowers  
 Marcion, Marcionites, 39, 79, 122, 125, 143, 185  
*Melopepa*, 150  
 Milk and honey, 18, 19, 122, 125  
 Montanism, 78, 79, 130  
 Olives, 78–79  
 Oil, 77, 86  
     See also: anointing  
*Oikonomos*, 89, 132  
 Pascha, 13–14, 44, 135–136  
     See also: Fasting (paschal), Quartodecimans  
 Patrons, patronage, 38, 41–42, 44, 55–56, 59–60, 89, 96, 143, 144–147, 147–148, 152, 155, 173  
 Pentecost, 153  
 Pontianus, 14, 16, 24, 40, 49, 85, 93, 129  
*Porrectio instrumentorum*, 94  
 Prayer, times of, 169–171  
 Presbyters: see patrons  
*Pro-istamenois*: see patrons  
 Prophecy, Christian, 43, 97, 156, 168  
 Psalms, use in worship, 135–136  
 Quartodecimans, 14, 44, 142, 153–154, 161  
*qedusha*, 141  
 Readers, 94  
 Roses: see flowers  
 Sabbath, 110, 128, 141  
 Sarapion, 125  
 Schoolmasters, admission of to catechumenate, 102  
 Schools, ancient, 39–40  
 Scrutinies, 18, 107  
 Sick, visiting of, 155  
 Slaves, slavery, 89, 93, 99, 102–103  
 Soldiers, 102  
 Sophists, 93  
 Soter, 15

Spitting, 160, 167, 170, 172

*Sportulae*, 145

Statue

Of Hippolytean school, 17, 20,  
23–24, 102

price of, 44–45

Stipulations, 121–122

Subdeacons, 93

Symposia, 136, 145–146, 159–160

Teachers, 17, 38–39, 42, 62–63, 98–99,  
146, 162

See also: Schoolmasters, schools  
(ancient)

*Traditio symboli*, 107, 109

*Tutores*, 119, 198

Valentinus, 39

Victor, 13–14, 39, 44, 129, 184

Virgins, appointment of, 96

Visions, 97

Water at the eucharist, 19, 125–126

Widows, 95–96, 147–148

Zephyrinus, 42, 55

POPULAR PATRISTICS SERIES

- 1 *On the Priesthood*  
St John Chrysostom
- 2 *Lectures on the Christian Sacraments*  
St Cyril of Jerusalem
- 3 *On the Incarnation*  
St Athanasius
- 4 *On the Divine Images*  
St John of Damascus
- 5 *On the Holy Spirit*  
St Basil the Great
- 6 *On the Holy Icons*  
St Theodore the Studite
- 7 *On Marriage and Family Life*  
St John Chrysostom
- 8 *On the Divine Liturgy*  
St Germanus
- 9 *On Wealth and Poverty*  
St John Chrysostom
- 10 *Hymns on Paradise*  
St Ephrem the Syrian
- 11 *On Ascetical Life*  
St Isaac of Nineveh
- 12 *On the Soul and Resurrection*  
St Gregory of Nyssa
- 13 *On the Unity of Christ*  
St Cyril of Alexandria
- 14 *On the Mystical Life, vol. 1*  
St Symeon the New Theologian
- 15 *On the Mystical Life, vol. 2*  
St Symeon the New Theologian
- 16 *On the Mystical Life, vol. 3*  
St Symeon the New Theologian
- 17 *On the Apostolic Preaching*  
St Irenaeus
- 18 *On the Dormition*  
Early Patristic Homilies
- 19 *On the Mother of God*  
Jacob of Serug
- 20 *On Pascha*  
Melito of Sardis
- 21 *On God and Man*  
The Theological Poetry of  
St Gregory of Nazianzus
- 22 *On the Apostolic Tradition*  
Hippolytus
- 23 *On God and Christ*  
St Gregory of Nazianzus
- 24 *Three Treatises on the Divine Images*  
St John of Damascus
- 25 *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ*  
St Maximus the Confessor
- 26 *Letters from the Desert*  
Barsanuphius and John
- 27 *Four Desert Fathers*  
Pambo, Evagrius, Macarius of  
Egypt, and Macarius of Alexandria
- 28 *Saint Macarius the Spiritbearer*  
Coptic Texts
- 29 *On the Lord's Prayer*  
Tertulian, Cyprian, Origen
- 30 *On the Human Condition*  
St Basil the Great
- 31 *The Cult of the Saints*  
St John Chrysostom
- 32 *On the Church: Select Treatises*  
St Cyprian of Carthage
- 33 *On the Church: Select Letters*  
St Cyprian of Carthage



ST VLADIMIR'S SEMINARY PRESS  
1-800-204-2665 • [www.svspress.com](http://www.svspress.com)